PIETER VAN DER LUGT

RHETORICAL CRITICISM AND THE POETRY OF THE BOOK OF JOB

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/rhetoricalcritic0000vand

RHETORICAL CRITICISM AND THE POETRY OF THE BOOK OF JOB

OUDTESTAMENTISCHE STUDIËN

NAMENS HET OUDTESTAMENTISCH
WERKGEZELSCHAP IN NEDERLAND

UITGEGEVEN DOOR

A. S. VAN DER WOUDE
GRONINGEN

DEEL XXXII

RHETORICAL CRITICISM AND THE POETRY OF THE BOOK OF JOB

BY

PIETER VAN DER LUGT

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1995

The investigations were supported in part by the Foundation for Research in the field of Theology and the science of Religions in the Netherlands, which is subsidized by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

BS
1415.2
.V36
1995

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Van der Lugt, Pieter.
Rhetorical criticism and the poetry of the book of Job / by Pieter van der Lugt.
p. cm. — (Oudtestamentische studiën, ISSN 0169-7226 ; d. 32)
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 9004103260 (alk. paper)
1. Bible. O.T. Job—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Rhetoric in the Bible. I. Title. II. Series.
BS1415.2.V36 1995
223'.1066—dc20 95-11575
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Lugt, Pieter van der:
Rhetorical criticism and the poetry of the book of Job / by Pieter van der Lugt – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1995
(Oudtestamentische Studiën ; Deel 32)
ISBN 90-04-10326-0
NE: GT

ISSN 0169-7226
ISBN 90 04 10326 0

© Copyright 1995 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

'For everything a fixed season,
and a time for every affair under heaven . . . '

Ecclesiastes 3,1

CONTENTS

Preface xiii

Abbreviations xv

PART I: A History of Investigation into the Strophic Structure of the Book of Job

1 The masoretic verse as starting point 2
- 1.1 F.B. Köster 2
- 1.2 Further in the line of Köster 3

2 The colon as the fundamental unit of the strophe 6

3 Formal indications of strophic structure 9
- 3.1 The tricolon as indicator of transition 9
- 3.2 Responsio, concatenatio and inclusio 10
- 3.3 Strophe, antistrophe and 'Zwischenstrophe' 13

4 Recent developments 15
- 4.1 E.J. Kissane 15
- 4.2 W.A. Irwin 16
- 4.3 J. Herz 17
- 4.4 P.W. Skehan 17
- 4.5 The commentaries: Terrien, Fohrer, Horst, Van Selms, Clines 20
- 4.6 E.C. Webster 22
- 4.7 E.B. Smick 23

5 Critical evaluations 25

PART II: Job 3 and the First Speech-Cycle (Job 4–14)

1 A methodology of rhetorical analysis 31
- 1.1 The need for a 'fresh' approach 31
- 1.2 The logical grouping of the contents 38

1.3 Transition markers 39
1.4 Verbal repetitions 43
1.5 Different divisions 46
1.6 Comments and summary 47
1.7 The reproduction of the texts 48

2 Job's opening lament: Job 3 50

3 Eliphaz's first speech (1): Job 4 61

4 Eliphaz's first speech (2): Job 5 70

5 Job's first reply to Eliphaz (1): Job 6 80

6 Job's first reply to Eliphaz (2): Job 7 90

7 Bildad's first speech: Job 8 102

8 Job's first reply to Bildad (1): Job 9 110

9 Job's first reply to Bildad (2): Job 10 124

10 Zophar's first speech: Job 11 133

11 Job's first reply to Zophar (1): Job 12 142

12 Job's first reply to Zophar (2): Job 13 152

13 Job's first reply to Zophar (3): Job 14 165

PART III: The Second Speech-Cycle (Job 15–26) and Job 40,1–5

1 Eliphaz's second speech (1): Job 15,2–16 176

2 Eliphaz's second speech (2): Job 15,17–35 184

3 Job's second reply to Eliphaz: Job 16–17 193

4 Bildad's second speech: Job 18 208

5 Job's second reply to Bildad: Job 19 217

6 Zophar's second speech: Job 20 230
7 Job's second reply to Zophar: Job 21 240
8 Eliphaz's third speech: Job 22 255
9 Job's third reply to Eliphaz: Job 23 265
10 'Bildad's third speech': Job 24 274
11 'Job's third reply to Bildad': Job 25–26 286
12 God's closing comment and Job's reaction: Job 40,1–5 297

PART IV: The Third Speech-Cycle (Job 27–31 and 38–41) and Job 42,1–6

1 Job's final reply to his friends (1): Job 27 299
2 Job's final reply to his friends (2): Job 28 309
3 Job's last speech (1): Job 29 325
4 Job's last speech (2): Job 30 335
5 Job's last speech (3): Job 31 348
6 God's first reply to Job (1): Job 38,2–38 362
7 God's first reply to Job (2): Job 38,39–39,30 377
8 God's second reply to Job: Job 40,7–41,26 390
9 Job's final reaction: Job 42,2–6 407

PART V: The Elihu-Speeches (Job 32–37): for further study

1 Elihu's first reply to Job (1): Job 32 410
2 Elihu's first reply to Job (2): Job 33 420

3 Elihu's second reply to Job: Job 34 429

4 Elihu's third reply to Job: Job 35 439

5 Elihu's fourth reply to Job: Job 36–37 444

PART VI: Systematic Observations or an Introduction to the Design of Biblical Poetry

1 The macrostructure of the poems 456
- 1.1 General outline . . . 456
- 1.2 Systematic approach . . . 460
  - 1.2.1 Design on the level of the cantos . . . 461
  - 1.2.2 The seven-line canto in the design of the poems . . . 463
  - 1.2.3 The 4.4.2 and 2.4.4 canto design . . . 464
  - 1.2.4 Design on the level of the canticles . . . 465
  - 1.2.5 Design on the level of the strophes . . . 467
  - 1.2.6 Characteristics of the opening and closing units . . . 468
  - 1.2.7 Relationship between the length of cantos in successive poems . . . 471

2 Tricola in the structure of the poems 474
- 2.1 Introduction . . . 474
- 2.2 The tricolon and the structure of the strophe . . . 478
- 2.3 The tricolon as transition marker . . . 480
- 2.4 Strophes with a 'projecting word' and their function . . . 483

3 Transition markers 486
- 3.1 In the first line of the strophe . . . 487
- 3.2 In the last line of the strophe . . . 498
- 3.3 Conclusion . . . 502

PART VII: The Design of the Speech-Cycles

1 Job 25–26 as Job's closing speech within the second cycle 504
- 1.1 Introduction . . . 504
- 1.2 Conceptions of death and the underworld in chs. 3–26 . . . 509
  - 1.2.1 Death and the underworld in chs. 3–14 (cycle I) . . . 509

1.2.2 Death and the underworld in chs. 15–26 (cycle II) . . 511
1.3 Chs. 15–26 as a second, complete speech-cycle 515
1.4 The 270 poetic lines of cycles I and II 517
1.4.1 The 270 lines of chs. 4–14 (cycle I) 518
1.4.2 The 270 lines of chs. 15–26 (cycle II) 518

2 Job 27–28 as Job's opening speech within the third cycle 520
2.1 Introduction 520
2.2 The identity of the wicked in ch. 27 520
2.3 The function of the quest for wisdom in ch. 28 521
2.4 The relationship between chs. 27 and 28 in the context of the book of Job 526
2.5 The structure of the third speech-cycle 530
2.5.1 The structure of the third speech-cycle 530
2.5.2 The original position of 40,1–5 531
2.5.3 Cycle III as a relatively independent dialogue 532
2.6 The 270 poetic lines of the third speech-cycle 535

Definitions 537
Bibliography 541

PREFACE

Perhaps I must recommend the reader to study this book backwards. The final part (part VII) is probably most interesting for those who for the first time bury themselves in the literary and theological problems which so abundantly occur in the book of Job. However, the conclusions of that final part are firmly based on the previous, rhetorical analyses. I hope to have excited enough interest at the end of the book so that some readers will also take up the study of the structures of the individual poems. Again, I recommend these persevering readers to study these sections backwards, that is to say, in the first place to take notice of the 'comments and summary' (analyses x.6). These 'comments' try to lead the way through the bare catalogues of the preceding analyses (x.3–5). To see the whole problem of rhetorical structures in the book of Job (and of Hebrew poetry in general) in the right perspective one must pay attention to the first part of this study. Maybe some readers will get down to these historical explanations.

I am deeply indebted to Ms N.Chr. Wielenga (Dokkum) for her help in translating this book and her valuable suggestions for improving its style. I also wish to thank dr. J.P. Fokkelman (Leiden) for his warm interest in the progression of this study and for his critical remarks as to my methodological approach and many structural elements which characterize the analyses of the poems.[1] Without the patience and understanding of my wife Gerry there would have been no pleasure at all in writing this book. Moreover, she was actively involved when large parts of the typescript had to be put into the computer.

Thanks are also due to prof. dr. J.C. de Moor (Kampen) and the Theological University of Kampen (the Netherlands) for setting up excellent, external conditions in which the final stage of this study could be carried through.

---

[1] References to Fokkelman in parenthesis concern these private communications.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AJBI	*Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute*
ANET	J.B. Pritchard (ed.), *Anient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3rd edn 1969
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
BK	Biblischer Kommentar
BS	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
ET	*The Expository Times*
GKC	W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd edn 1946
Greg	*Gregorianum*
HAL	Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTS	*Hervormde Teologiese Studies*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series
KBS	Katholieke Bijbelstichting
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
LXX	Septuaginta
MDB	*Le monde de la Bible*
MT	Masoretic Text
NAB	New American Bible
NBG	Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap
NEB	New English Bible
NJPS	New Jewish Publication Society Version
OTE	*Old Testament Essays*
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën

PHPT	A. Preminger (ed.), *The Princeton Handbook of Poetic Terms*, Princeton (New Jersey): Princeton University Press, 1986
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RSR	*Recherches de Science Religieuse*
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SJOT	Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament
STR	P. van der Lugt, *Strofische structuren in de bijbels-hebreeuwse poëzie*, Kampen: Kok, 1980
SupplVT	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
ThR	*Theologische Rundschau*
TOB	Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible
TTZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift*
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTS	see SupplVT
ZAH	*Zeitschrift für Althebraistik*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie and Kirche*

PART I

A History of Investigation into the Strophic Structure of the Book of Job

Rhetorical criticism is a modern term for a way of approach in the field of exegesis of the Hebrew Bible which is in fact not entirely new. However, former commentaries and special studies used to focus on only one or two aspects of this exegetical method, the metre and/or the strophic structure of Hebrew poetry. This also applies to the exegesis of the book of Job. In this study not all the elements of rhetorical criticism will be extensively dealt with either. Special attention will be devoted to the traditionally so-called 'strophic structure' of the book of Job. It is my contention that previous research was investigating one of the main aspects of the rhetorical structure of Hebrew poetry when looking for its strophic framework. Therefore, a history of rhetorical criticism has to focus on previous research as to the strophic structure of Hebrew poetry.

Modern critics sometimes create the impression that it is hardly worthwhile to present the efforts of previous research when discussing the strophic arrangement of Hebrew poetry. Thus it is suggested that serious study of this aspect of rhetorical criticism should only have started in recent times. This observation also pertains to studies of the poetic structures in the book of Job. Brief insight into earlier research is afforded by Möller. This scholar discusses the theories of Hebrew strophic structure expressed by Stevenson, Hölscher, Szczygiel, Ley and Hontheim.[1] From Gordis we receive a cursory bibliography of relevant literature.[2] However, to attain a good understanding of the problem of strophic structure in the book of Job it is essential to engage in a more in-depth and systematic analysis of the history of investigation. This history now spans more than 150 years.[3]

---

[1] H. Möller, *Sinn und Aufbau des Buches Hiob*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1955, pp. 43–45. The order of treatment appears to be quite arbitrary.

[2] R. Gordis, *The Book of Job* (Moreshet Series 2), New York: Jewish Theological

1 The masoretic verse as starting point

1.1 F.B. Köster

The history of strophic research begins, as far as the book of Job is concerned, with *F.B. Köster.* This scholar is also known for his theory of strophic structure in the Psalms.[4] In 1831 Köster presented a study of Job and Ecclesiasticus in which he offered translations, printed in such a way as to clearly delineate strophic structure.[5] In Köster's estimation the phenomenon of strophic arrangement in Hebrew poetry was closely correlated with the presence of parallelism within the verse, described by Lowth in 1753 as the *parallelismus membrorum.* 'Wie die Verse aus einer Zusammenfassung paralleler Glieder entstehn, eben so bilden sich durch Zusammenfassung paralleler Verse gewisse Strophen'.[6] In contrast to parallelism within the verse, however, Köster viewed strophic structure as an effort towards external symmetry. Discernment of these strophes particularly depends on the coherence of content and the progression of thought within the masoretic verses. However, in the book of Job chapters are seldom found with all the strophes containing an identical number of verses. Some strophes seem to be one verse short, or have an extra verse. Sometimes there is an isolated verse which does not appear to belong to a strophe. With this reservation Köster distinguishes four strophic structures in the

---

Seminary of America, 1978, p. 507. See also C. Kuhl, 'Neuere Literarkritik des Buches Hiob', *ThR* 21 (1953), pp. 183 85; S.L. Terrien, *Job* (CAT 13), Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963, p. 33 n. 2. Kuhl discusses, among others, Condamin, Hölscher, Peters, Irwin and Kissane.

[3] The historical survey offered here is a revision of my article 'Strophes and Stanzas in the Book of Job. A Historical Survey', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 235-64. See also my *Strofische structuren in de bijbels-hebreeuwse poëzie*, Kampen: Kok, 1980, pp. 1-120 (furthermore STR). The review in that study enables the reader to put the description below in a broader perspective. Emphasis is laid there on the history of strophic research in the Psalms.

[4] See F. Köster, 'Die Strophen, oder der Parallelismus der Verse der hebräischen Poesie', *ThStKr* 4 (1831), pp. 40–114; —, *Die Psalmen nach ihrer strophischen Anordnung übersetzt*, Königsberg, 1837.

[5] See F.B. Köster, *Das Buch Hiob und der Prediger Salomos nach ihrer strophischen Anordnung übersetzt*, Schleswig: Im Königlichen Taubstummen-Institut, 1831, esp. pp. VIII–XXIV.

[6] Köster, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. VIII.

book of Job: (a) strophes with an equal number of verses, e.g., the strophic scheme of 4×5 (Job 4) or 7×3 (Job 8); (b) strophes with progressively higher verse totals, e.g., 3.4.5.5.5 (Job 10); (c) an antistrophic structure such as 4.3.2.3.4 (Job 17); (d) a parallel strophic structure, e.g., 3.2.4|3.2.4 (Job 18).

As already stated, Köster believed that in discerning the strophes particular attention must be paid to the coherence of thought in the verses. He suggested that virtually no formal features were to be found in the book of Job to help recognize the strophes. According to Köster, this was in contrast to the strophic techniques the Hebrew poets used in the psalms and the prophets. Thus, in the book of Job he sought in vain for the clearest feature of strophic structure, the refrain. It also lacked 'gewisse stehende Wörter und Ausrufungen, welche sonst den Anfang der Strophe zu bezeichnen pflegen'.[7] As an exception to this rule Köster pointed to the frequent use in Job of the particle *hn* ('behold'). This particle usually suggests the beginning of a new strophe. Especially chapter 36 provides a striking example of this; note vv. 5, 22, 26 and 30. On these grounds Köster concluded that the 'Sinn-Abschnitte' form the most reliable point of departure in the search for strophic structure in the book of Job.

1.2 Further in the line of Köster

In the previous century Köster's insights exercised considerable influence on the critical study of Hebrew poetry. *J.G. Stickel* agreed with this theory in principle, though in its practical implementation he made many corrections.[8] The commentary on Job by K. Schlottmann also took Köster's insights very seriously.[9] In his Job commentary of 1869 *A. Dillmann* in turn demonstrated his dependence on Schlottmann for his structural analysis of the speeches.[10] According to Dillmann the exegete could no longer avoid a discussion of the 'logische und strophische Gliederung der Reden'.[11] Schlottmann and Dillmann often introduce greater precision to Köster's strophic delimitations. This is evident, for example, in the strophic analyses offered for Job 8 by Köster and Dillmann respectively. While Köster finds in this chapter a 7×3 structure, Dillmann offers a more precise pattern: 3.3||3.3|6||3. However, Schlottmann was the first who marked a step forward on the path of strophe research. Köster had already detected that some of the speeches in the book of Job could be divided into two or three parts, which encompass several strophes each. Chapter 3, for example, he divides into the sub-units of vv. 3–10, 11–19 and 20–26. Next, Schlottmann distinguished various layers in *every* poem. In other words, according to Schlottmann, the development of the thought within a poem was structured at various levels. As starting point Schlottmann frequently divides a poem into some major units. These major units, in turn, are further divided into strophes. And finally, according to Schlottmann, the strophes too continually demonstrate a particular poetic structuring which goes beyond the level of the *parallelismus membrorum.* So, for ch. 15 he suggests the following division: vv. 2–16 (first major unit), 17–19 ('Zwischenglied'), 20–35 (second major unit). The strophes he marks as vv. 2–6, 7–11, 12–16, 17–19, 20–24, 25–30, 31–35. As strophic scheme Schlottmann thus suggests a 5.5.5|3|5.6.5 pattern. Next, the structure of the strophes can be presented as 2.2.1|2.2.1|2.2.1||3||3.2|2.2.2|3.2.

---

[7] Köster, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. IX. The absence of these formal features was judged to be a result of the brevity 'der gnomischen Dichtkunst'.

[8] See J.G. Stickel, *Das Buch Hiob*, Leipzig, 1842, esp. pp. 278–83.

[9] See K. Schlottmann, *Das Buch Hiob*, Berlin: Wiegandt & Brieben, 1851, esp. pp. 67–68.

[10] See A. Dillmann, *Hiob* (KeH 2. Lief.), Leipzig, 3rd edn 1869. Regarding the 4th edition of this commentary from 1891 see below, section 2.

[11] Dillmann (1869), p. VII.

In this connection mention must also be made of the contribution by *H. Ewald.*[12] In Ewald's opinion, not one speech consists of all uniform strophes. Rather, various groups of uniform strophes follow one another within the progression of the speech.[13] The most noteworthy was judged to be that a single verse would frequently interrupt a regular series of strophes when the emotions could no longer be restrained. Ewald refers here to 5,17.27 9,29 13,13 21,16 24,13 19,21–22. This variegated interchanging of strophic structure was credited to the 'dramatic' character of the book of Job.

In the twentieth century *H. Möller* made more or less explicit recourse to the strophic theories of Köster.[14] Typical of this author is a repeated assertion of an antistrophic structure in the poetic main body of the book of Job; see Köster's third category of strophic structure. Möller speaks here of 'chiastic' strophic arrangement; see, e.g., 20.7.20 (chs. 4–5), 10.13.10 (chs. 9,25 10,22) or 10.9.10 (ch. 13). As these strophic schemes already depict, for Möller the strophes are frequently much lengthier than is the case with

---

[12] See H. Ewald, *Allgemeines über die hebräische Dichtung und über das Psalmenbuch* (Die Dichter des Alten Bundes I.1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2nd edn 1866, esp. pp. 195–97. By the same author, *Das Buch Ijob* (Die Dichter des Alten Bundes III), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2nd edn 1854.

[13] Therefore, Ewald was already reproached by Stickel for the fact that the strophes presupposed were too long and that his strophic schemes did not show enough regularity; see Stickel (1842), p. 279.

[14] See H. Möller, *Sinn und Aufbau des Buches Hiob*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1955, pp. 45–47.

Köster.[15]

All of the authors mentioned thus far have a common principle, namely the principle of measuring the length of a Hebrew strophe in terms of the *masoretic* verses constituent to the particular unit.[16] Dillmann continued this practice through the 1869 edition of his commentary. In the edition of 1891, however, he broke a new trail in this respect! He then adopted what was at the time the most accessible conception of the delimitation of the Hebrew verse line. A new phase had dawned in the study of strophic structure.

---

[15] However, the length of Möller's strophes is somehow connected with the length of the concerning poems. In shorter poems two-line and three-line strophes are also recognized; see, e.g., ch. 26 (structure: 2.1.3.3.3.1).

[16] This is also done in the commentaries of Zöckler, *Das Buch Job*, Bielefeld usw., 1872 and F. Hitzig, *Das Buch Hiob*, Leipzig und Heidelberg: C.F. Winter, 1874.

2 The colon as fundamental unit

Shortly after publishing his ideas about the strophic structure of Hebrew poetry, Köster was indirectly attacked by *J.G. Sommer.* Sommer too was under the impression that the poetry of the Hebrew Bible shows a strophic structure. In 1846 he attempted to demonstrate, however, that the length of the strophe was determined by the sum total of the verse elements, called 'stichoi', of which the strophe is constructed.[1] He thereby departed from Köster's view that the masoretic verse is the most important building block of the Hebrew strophe. Sommer's conclusions slowly gained increasing support amongst other researchers of biblical poetry.

As far as the strophic structure of the book of Job is concerned, it was particularly *Franz Delitzsch*'s commentary that for the first time proceeded from the colon as the fundamental unit of the strophe.[2] Especially the study by *A. Merx* gained a certain degree of fame in this regard.[3] In contrast to Delitzsch, Merx suggested that within a given pericope a certain amount of consistency must be seen in the length of the strophes; and furthermore, it is established that any given strophe could not include more than eight cola.[4] Consequently, we find with Merx strophic schemes like 6.6.6|8.8.8 (ch. 8), and 4.4.4.4|4.6.6.4|4.6.4.6 (ch. 22); while Delitzsch proposes schemes such as 6.7.6.10.8.6 (ch. 8). According to Merx, a shift to a new strophic structure within a given poem is always indicative of a shift in the debate, 'so daß in den strophischen Systemen zugleich die ganze logische Anordnung der Reden ausgedrückt liegt'.[5]

Much affinity to the strophic analyses of Merx is encountered in *G.H.B. Wright*'s translation of the book of Job.[6] Wright emphasizes that a distinction must be made between what he terms 'cantos' and 'stanzas'. A canto always includes several stanzas; two or more cantos together constitute a complete poem.[7] In relatively short poems, such as Job 8 and 11 for example, the cantos may not be present. 'There is not however the regularity in the formation of these that is required in modern poetry'.[8]

---

[1] See J.G. Sommer, 'Die alphabetischen Lieder von Seiten ihrer Structur und Integrität' (Biblische Abhandlungen I), Bonn, 1846, pp. 93–182. Regarding Sommer, see now STR, pp. 8–13.

[2] See Franz Delitzsch, *das Buch Iob* (Keil-Delitzsch IV.2), Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 2nd edn 1876, esp. pp. 13–14.

[3] A. Merx, *Das Gedicht von Hiob*, Jena, 1871, esp. pp. LXXV–LXXXVIII.

[4] Merx (1871), pp. LXXVI and LXXVIII. Cf. Delitzsch: 'Ueberhaupt ist es nicht unsere Meinung, das Buch bestehe durchweg aus liederartig strophischen Reden' (1869, p. 14).

[5] Merx (1871), p. LXXX. As an example Merx points to the structure of Job 15: 6.4.4.4|6.6.6.6.6|7.7.8. As noted above (section 1.2), in 1891 Dillmann accepted the position of Delitzsch and Merx concerning the length of the Hebrew poetic line. According to Dillmann one receives a more precise picture of the length of the strophe by counting the number of cola (4th edn 1891, p. XXIV).

[6] See G.H.B. Wright, *The book of Job*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1883, see esp. pp. 23–25. In his foreword Wright states that his book 'is intended to follow in the wake of the Critical Edition of A. Merx'.

G. Bickell too used the total number of cola to measure the extent of a strophe.[9] In contrast to Delitzsch, Merx and Wright, however, Bickell was of the opinion that the author of the book of Job utilized only one strophic form, namely the 'tetrastich' strophe.[10] *B. Duhm*, in his Job commentary, accepts Bickell's position[11], though in the concrete application of this starting point he is often more independent of Bickell's work than is *C.J. Ball*, who also purported that strophes in the book of Job consist singularly of tetracola.[12] Duhm combined the tetracolic strophes together into progressively higher unities, which represent the logically determined major units of the speeches (for example 11,2–12 and 13–20).

Although *M. Löhr* determined the extent of a strophe by the total of bicola rather than simply by the number of the cola, his position should be mentioned in this context because in certain respects he went a step further than Duhm. Löhr made an attempt to prove that in a number of the speeches in the book of Job not only the strophes are of equal length, but that these uniform strophes also constitute higher units, which produce 'Sinnesabschnitte' of uniform length.[13] In chs. 6–7 this produces, for example, the structure 4×2|4×2|4×2|4×2|4×2|4×2.

---

[7] The term 'canto' for a poem or section of a poem is now also used in circles of the 'Kampen School'; see, e.g., J.C. de Moor, 'The Integrity of Isaiah 40', in *Mesopotamica—Ugaritica—Biblica. FS Kurt Bergerhof*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1993, pp. 181–216.

[8] Wright (1883), p. 23. Merx is unjustly reproached here for not having had an eye for the 'cantos'. At times there is a high degree of conformity between the strophic analyses of Merx and Wright; see, e.g., chs. 9–10: 6.6.6.6|6.8.8.8.8|6.8.8.8.8|6.4.6 (Merx); 6.6.6.6|6.8.8.8.8|8.8.6|8.8.8|8.5.5.7 (Wright). But frequently their conclusions disagree; e.g., regarding ch. 22: 6.6.6|8.8.4|4.8.8 (Wright); for Merx see above.

[9] About Bickell see now STR, pp. 28–30 and 133 (!).

[10] See G. Bickell, 'Kritische Bearbeitung des Iobdialogs', WKZM 6 (1892), pp. 137–147, 241–257, 327–334; —, WZKM 7 (1893), pp. 1–20, 153–168; note esp. 6 (1892), p. 137. See from the same author: *Das Buch Job nach Anleitung der Strophik und der Septuaginta*, Wien: Druck und Verlag von Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1894, esp. p. 11.

[11] B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob* (KHC 16), Freiburg i.Br.: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897. According to Duhm this very simple form of strophic structure was the most appropriate for the 'lange Reihen von Weisheitsreden' (at Job 3,2).

[12] C.J. Ball, *The Book of Job*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1922. Ball speaks in this connection of 'quatrains'. Despite the numerous interpolations in the text this strophic form is not totally unrecognizable according to Ball (p. 34).

[13] M. Löhr, 'Beobachtungen zur Strophik im Buche Hiob', in *Abhandlungen zur semitischen Religionskunde und Sprachwissenschaft, FS W.W. Graf von Baudissin* (BZAW 33), Giessen: Töpelmann Verlag, 1918, pp. 303–21. We find here a strophic analysis of

G. Beer already expressed his reservation regarding the strophic theories of Bickell and Duhm. In certain chapters the presence of four-line strophes is evident according to Beer. But this scholar hesitated to conclude on this basis that the original poem was composed entirely of four-line strophes.[14] *G. Hölscher* too believed that stricktly speaking it was not possible to produce conclusive evidence for exclusively four-line strophes in the book of Job. He was, nevertheless, strongly inclined to agree that the poet of the book of Job had pursued some such structuring scheme.[15] More recently *A. de Wilde* has explicitly concurred with Hölscher's opinion.[16] De Wilde sees himself standing in a line of tradition which boasts Bickell as its first representative.[17] Nevertheless, De Wilde assumes that in certain places the structure of tetrastich strophes is broken by divergent structures: (a) at the end of a speech or substantial pericope the strophes can be lengthened, the so-called 'Fermatstrophen' (among others, 9,23–24 and 10,20–22); (b) two-line strophes sometimes serve somewhat as a heading (e.g., 24,1 and 37,1.14), or as a conclusion to, and emphasis of, what precedes (e.g., 5,27); (c) in a few instances we find short series of 'hexastich' strophes (3,11–19 4,12–21 6,8–13).[18]

Job 3–7 19 29–31 38–40,14 and 42,2–6. See by the same author: 'Die drei Bildad-Reden im Buche Hiob', in *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, FS K. Budde* (BZAW 34), Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1920, pp. 107–12, and 'Job c. 28', in *Oriental Studies Presented to Paul Haupt*, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1926, pp. 67–70.

[14] See G. Beer, *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, Marburg: Elwert, 1897, p. VIII.

[15] G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob* (HAT 17), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2nd edn 1952, p. 8. In the commentary itself the layout of the translation of the speeches suggests that Hölscher, like Löhr, viewed the bicolon as the Hebrew poetic line; repeatedly the two components of this line (the cola) are printed side by side. Furthermore, consistently two (!) of these bicola are combined together into a strophe. See further in this connection S. Mowinckel, *Real and Apparent Tricola in Hebrew Psalm Poetry* (ANVAO 2), Oslo: H. Aschehoug & co. (W. Nygaard), 1957, p. 102. Mowinckel too accepts that the poetic portions of Job are written in 'basic stanzas' of two bicola (occasionally tricola).

[16] A. de Wilde, *Das Buch Hiob* (OTS 22), Leiden: Brill, 1981, p. 63.

[17] De Wilde (1981), p. VIII. In approximately 40 instances De Wilde deems it necessary to resort to emendation of a damaged text (transposition, addition or deletion of poetic lines; p. 64). Despite the circumspect manner in which these conjectures are introduced I note little difference between his approach and that of Bickell *cum suis*.

[18] See De Wilde (1981), pp. 64–65. The tricola which appear in some instances are presumably later glosses (De Wilde, p. 65).

3 Formal indications of strophic structure

It has already been noted above (section 1.1) that according to Köster in the book of Job formal criteria, by which to discern strophic structure, are virtually non-existent. Köster attempted to delineate an acceptable strophic structure of the speeches purely by means of consideration of contents. Neverthless, he noted that the particle *hn* ('behold') often serves to mark the beginning or the end of a strophe. And Dillmann, in his commentary on chs. 3 and 33, noted the repetition of *lmh* ('why?') in 3,11.20 and *w'th* ('and now') in 30,1.9.16, by means of which the beginning of a strophe is repeatedly called to attention. In the 19th century, however, scholars were unable to discover many additional, formal indicators of strophic structure in the book of Job. That is why there was a general consensus about Köster's most important presupposition. But that was not only so in the previous century. As will be shown in the following discussion, the conclusion that in the book of Job research into strophic structure of the debate speeches must be conducted essentially on the grounds of the progression of content and thought-development continues to be generally defended, still today.

3.1 The tricolon as indicator of transition

It can be observed, however, that since the end of the previous century research into a more systematic manner of identifying formal markers of strophic structure in the book of Job has not been entirely lacking. *J. Ley*, in his metric analysis of the poetic line in the book of Job, strongly opposed the opinions of his contemporaries who believed that the length of the Hebrew strophe could be determined by the total number of cola (stichoi) upon which this poetic unit is built.[1] On the other hand Ley also considered it incorrect to view the masoretic verse as the fundamental building block of the strophe. In a number of instances we are confronted with 'Doppelverse'.[2] In his discussion of this question Ley notes the appearance of many tricola at the end of the strophe; he mentions among others 4,16 6,4.10 7,4 9,24 10,17 11,20 14,12. Sometimes such a tricolic verse appears at the beginning of a logical entity (e.g., 10,1 14,7). 'Es liegt daher die Vermutung nahe, daß diese Langverse als ein metrisches Hilfsmittel zur Bezeichnung des Schlusses oder des Anfanges der Abschnitte gebraucht wurden'.[3] By utilizing these metric indicators, along with other things, Ley arrived at a reasonably unified strophic structure for the speeches in the book of Job: e.g., 3.3.3.4.4.3.3.3.3 (ch. 6); 4.4.5.5.5 (ch. 10); 7×3 (ch. 11); 5.5.5|5.5.5 (ch. 15; vv. 17–19 are taken as a later addition).[4] He is unable, however, to find a similar unified structure in the Elihu-speeches.[5]

---

[1] J. Ley, 'Die metrische Beschaffenheit des Buches Hiob', *ThStKr* 68 (1895), pp. 635–92; esp. pp. 635–38. Among other points Ley emphasized that by counting the number of cola the 'Konformität der ... Strophen' can be disrupted when tricolic verses occur in a strophe (cf. above, section 2 n. 5, about Dillmann). I note, however, that Ley is not always consistent in this regard; see, e.g., (1895), pp. 636–37.

[2] Ley (1895), p. 635. Ley mentions 7,20.21 11,6 16,4 31,35 37,12 42,3. Although an important decision is here at stake the results of this insight are not as important for strophic research in the book of Job as is the case, for example, in the Psalms or in the prophets. This is mainly due to the fact that the poetic lines delineated by Ley in the book of Job generally concur with the masoretic verses, which in turn are usually composed of two cola. See about the problem of the length of the poetic line in Hebrew poetry STR, pp. 121–209.

3.2 Responsio, concatenatio and inclusio

A completely different indication of strophic structure in Hebrew poetry was concentrated upon at the end of the previous century in the research by *D.H. Müller*. According to Müller the strophes in Hebrew poetry may be identified by the poet's use of the stylistic devices of 'Responsion', 'Concatenatio', and 'Inclusio'. The phenomenon of responsio had developed out of the *parallelismus membrorum*. Responsio is for the structure of the Hebrew poem what parallelismus is for the structure of the Hebrew verse. 'Bei streng durchgeführter Responsion correspondirt jede Zeile der einen Strophe mit der entsprechenden Zeile der Zweiten Strophe entweder wörtlich genau oder gedanklich, parallel oder antithetisch'.[6] In concatenatio the end of one strophe is logically or formally connected with the beginning of the following strophe. The stylistic device of inclusio serves to demarcate the boundaries of the strophe from the surrounding material, and to emphasize the particular character of the strophe. In Müller's opinion responsio had its origin in the manner by which the oldest prophecies in Israel were presented. These were intended to be sung responsively and were frequently structured with a strophe and an antistrophe (cf. 1 Sam. 10,5 and 19,19–24). Müller ultimately presupposed Punic influence here.[7]

---

[3] Ley (1895), p. 636. This function is also ascribed by Ley to the 'fünftonige' and the 'achttonige' poetic lines (p. 638). The first category appears especially at the end of a strophe, e.g., 6,27 11,9 and 15,6.

[4] Regarding the speeches of Job in the first cycle, it is presupposed that each chapter contains an independent strophic schematization. This is also assumed for chs. 29–31; cf. Möller (1955), p. 47.

[5] Ley (1895), p. 678. Also Ewald was of the opinion that regular strophic structure was absent in chs. 32–37; so also Hitzig (1874). Cf. too the layout of these chapters in the translation of KBS. In his subsequent study on the book of Job Ley made only minor corrections upon these results. He positively did, e.g., in chs. 15 16–17 21–24 30–31 and 33. See J. Ley, *Das Buch Hiob*, Halle, 1903.

[6] D.H. Müller, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, vol. 1, Wien, 1896, p. 191. In fact a similar approach was previously suggested by Köster; see F. Köster, 'Die Strophen, oder der Parallelismus der Verse der hebräischen Poesie', *ThStKr* 4 (1831), pp. 48–49 (cf. about Köster above, section 1.1.)

While Müller was initially under the impression that the artistic forms he had researched were primarily present in the prophetic texts of the Hebrew Bible, two years later he detected the same principles operative in the Psalms and in the wisdom literature.[8] In the studies he then published we find, in addition to other material, an analysis of Job 14. According to Müller this chapter falls into three sections, each consisting of a strophe and an antistrophe: vv. 1–3.4–6|7–9.10–12|13–17.18–22 (structure: 6.6|7.7|11.11). In the first section Müller indicates a number of notable responsions between the strophe (vv. 1–3) and the antistrophe (vv. 4–6): *'dm ylwd 'šh* (v. 1a) // *ṭhwr mṭm'* (v. 4a); *qṣr ymym* (v. 1b) // *ḥrwṣym ymyw* (v. 5a); *pqḥt 'ynk* (v. 3a) // *š'h m'lyw* (v. 6a). The second strophe and its antistrophe relate to each other approximately as image and reflection. Vv. 7–9 speak about a 'dead' tree which could at anytime sprout again, while in vv. 10–12 Job says that man's death means his absolute end. In the third section the strophe suggests that there is a new life after death (vv. 13–17), which is immediately denied in the antistrophe (vv. 18–22).[9] In 1907 Müller once again turned to the strophic structure of the book of Job.[10] In the poems which he then analysed (chs. 4 and 6), Müller was unable to indicate any noteworthy responsions, but he remained convinced that one could not ignore the strophic structure of these chapters. The strophic structure was supposed to be closely related to the line of thought development and to show a certain degree of regularity: 10.10|11.11 (ch. 4) and 7.6|7.6|14.14|6 (ch. 6).

Müller's theory had a very significant influence upon research into the strophic structure of biblical Hebrew poetry in the beginning of the 20th century, and was also applied to research of the strophic structure in the speeches of the book of Job. *P. Vetter* already in 1897 came to the conclusion that the strophic structures of these speeches are often supported by certain 'äusserliche Kennzeichen'. In this connection Vetter mentions the refrain, responsio, anadiplosis and inclusio.[11] For the rest, according to Vetter as well, the strophic structure of a poem is primarily determined by 'die auf logischen Gesichtspunkten ruhende regelmäßige Wiederkehr einer bestimmten Gruppe von Versen'.[12] In chs. 3–27 and 29–31 the strophes usually contain only two and never more than three lines. In the Elihu-speeches (chs. 32–37) the extent varies from two to four lines.[13]

---

[7] See Müller (1896), ch. 5. Müller borrowed the term 'Responsion' from classical philology where it is used to designate the relationship between the strophes and the antistrophes in the chorus of the Greek drama; see Müller (1896), pp. 1–2.

[8] See D.H. Müller, *Strophenbau und Responsion*, Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1898.

[9] Müller (1898), pp. 66–71. Strophic schematization is here made dependent upon counting of the cola. However, in Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus Müller defends bicolic poetic lines (for further discussion of Müller's position see now STR, pp. 142–43). Job 14,4b and 14a are considered to be later glosses, following Merx and Budde respectively.

[10] D.H. Müller, *Komposition und Strophenbau*, Wien: Verlag der Israelitisch-Theologischen Lehranstalt, 1907, pp. 79–85.

Vetter's conclusion regarding the external literary form of the strophes in the book of Job is in agreement with the summary *N. Schlögl* provides of his standpoint: 'Eines der wichtigsten Kennzeichen der hebräischen Strophik und in ihrem ausgedehnten Gebrauch für diese geradezu charakteristisch sind die Kunstfiguren der Responsio (Entsprechung), Concatenatio (Verkettung) und Inclusio (Einschließung, Umrahmung)'.[14] Strophic poems, according to Schlögl, can usually be dissected into uniform strophes, and the 'gemischtstrophige Lieder' usually show strophic pairs (strophe and antistrophe), or two fairly long, uniform 'Stollen' and a shorter 'Abgesang'.[15] In the book of Job this may result in the following patterns: 3×20 (ch. 6); 7×22 (ch. 12–14); 7×10 (ch. 15); and 14.14.4/10.10.2 (ch. 5); 18.18.6 (ch. 8); 20.20.10 (ch. 22).[16]

We also find recognition of Müller's literary devices in the commentary on Job by *N. Peters*. According to Peters the mono-line, two-line and three-line strophes can be joined to form higher units. These higher units, however, do not constitute sections of uniform length within a given speech. As most important criteria for designating both the strophes and the higher poetic units, Peters lists among other things the 'Zusammengehörigkeit des Inhaltes, Wiederaufnahme (Anaphora), Entsprechung (Responsio), Einschließung (Inclusio) und Verkettung (Concatenatio)'.[17] Furthermore, tricolic lines can indicate the beginning or the end of a logical unit. Peters thinks here, for example, of 10,22 11,20 19,29 and 26,14.[18]

---

[11] P. Vetter, *Die Metrik des Buches Job* (Biblische Studien II.4), Freiburg i.Br.: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1897, p. 56 (cf. also pp. 30–31). Instead of 'Concatenatio' (Müller) Vetter uses the classical term 'anadiplosis' (see p. 31 n. 1).

[12] Vetter (1897), p. 30. Thus, with 'verse' a combination of two or three cola is understood (cf. pp. 1–2 and 27–28).

[13] Müller, however, was not always pleased with the analyses by Vetter; see Müller (1907), p. 79 n. 2 and p. 82 n. 1.

[14] N. Schlögl, *Die echte biblisch-hebräische Metrik* (Biblische Studien XVII.1), Freiburg i.Br., 1912, p. 101. In a discussion with Müller (*OLZ* 4 [1901], columns 417–18), Schlögl pointed out that E. Meier in 1856 had already recognized these stylistic devices in Hebrew poetry; see E. Meier, *Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Hebräer*, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 82–87, where a detailed analysis of the strophic structure in the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5) is offered. As an indicator of strophic structure Schlögl also mentions 'anaphora' with reference to Ps. 96 (compare vv. 1–2a with 7–8a; see Schlögl (1912), p. 98.

[15] Schlögl (1912), pp. 96–97.

[16] See N.J. Schlögl, *Das Buch Ijjob* (Die heiligen Schriften des Alten Bundes III.2), Wien und Leipzig, 1916. Schlögl consistently determines the length of a strophe by a set number of cola.

3.3 Strophe, antistrophe and 'Zwischenstrophe'

In *J. Hontheim*'s commentary the poetic main body of the book of Job is subjected to the strophic system of Zenner.[19] This system in turn displays clear affinity to the methodology of Müller. The method, therefore, is not totally unique. Zenner distinguished in Psalms between songs which could and could not be viewed as 'Chorlieder'. The uniqueness of choir songs was supposed to be that two uniform strophes (a strophe and an antistrophe) are always followed by a strophe with an irregular structure. This strophe in turn is again followed by two uniform strophes (a strophe and an antistrophe). The uniform strophes were respectively sung by two different temple choirs. The middle strophe, however, was sung by the two choirs alternating verse by verse. Zenner therefore terms it a 'Wechselstrophe'.[20] Hontheim asserted that the strophic structure of the 'Chorlieder' could also be found in the poetry of the book of Job. He proceeded on the assumption that the 'poetische' and the 'logische Gliederung' of the speeches must totally harmonize with each other. The term 'Wechselstrophe', however, he replaced with the term 'Zwischenstrophe', which was more appropriate in the book of Job. The strophes of which the debates are constructed always contain at least three lines.[21] Longer strophes can always be divided into groups of lines ('Zeilengruppen'); sometimes an independent line can also be found here. These 'Zeilengruppen' are frequently marked by 'besondere Kennzeichen'. Hontheim thinks for example of the repetititon of the word *šm* ('there') in 3,17 19 (see vv. 17a and 19a) and the repetititon of the root *bw'* ('to come') in 3,24–26 (see vv. 24a, 25b and 26b).[22] In determining the strophic structure we must also be attentive to a few frequently appearing

---

[17] N. Peters, *Das Buch Job* (EH 21), Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff, 1928, p. 74*. Peters determines the length of a strophe by the sum of the 'Langzeilen' (a 'Langzeile' is a bicolon or a tricolon; p. 69*).

[18] Peters (1928), p. 70*.

[19] J. Hontheim, *Das Buch Job —als strophisches Kunstwerk nachgewiesen, übersetzt und erklärt* (Biblische Studien IX.1–3), Freiburg i.Br.: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1904, esp. pp. 53–70.

[20] See J.K. Zenner, *Die Chorgesänge im Buche der Psalmen*, Freiburg i.Br.: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1896, esp. pp. 1–25.

[21] With a poetic line Hontheim thinks of mostly two, and sometimes three cola (pp. 53–54).

[22] Hontheim (1904), pp. 90–91.

'Figuren'. In this connection the stylistic devices of concatenatio, inclusio and responsio are again mentioned. The beginning of a new strophe can be marked by a certain 'Stichwort', e.g., by *w'th* ('and now') in ch. 30, or by *hn 'l* ('behold, God') in ch. 36, or by a certain particle, e.g., by *'k* in 13,20 16,7 30,24 33,8 and 35,13 (always at the beginning of an antistrophe). Tricola can also be used to indicate the beginning or the end of a strophe (though this type of line is also used elsewhere), as can the use of divine names. By using this system of analysis Hontheim attains schemes such as 4.4|3|8.8 (ch. 3), 3.3|6|4.4 (ch. 11) and 5.5|5|8.8 (ch. 15).[23]

Although *A. Condamin* was not fully in agreement with the methodology of Hontheim, he too attempted to apply Zenner's system to the speeches in the book of Job.[24] Condamin does so in Job 3 4–5 and 28. According to Condamin, the correctness of the divisions suggested by Hontheim for Job 28 could not be refuted: vv. 1–5.6–11|12–20|21–24.25–28 (structure: 6.6|9|4.4). But as far as external indicators are concerned, this scholar thought that the 'répétitions verbales, destinées à souligner la distincton des strophes' in the book of Job are seldom encountered ('sont rares'); ch. 28 is an exception to this rule.[25]

---

[23] Cf. the criticism by Peters (1928), pp. 75*–76*.

[24] A. Condamin, *Poèmes de la Bible*, Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, 2nd edn 1933, pp. 192–205.

[25] Condamin (1933), p. 203. Like Hontheim he too rejects the term 'Wechselstrophe' (Zenner) and speaks of a 'strophe intermédiaire' (pp. 28–29). In the context of this section mention may also be made of F. Zorell, 'Ex disputatione Jobi cum amicis suis', *VD* 10 (1930), pp. 265–68 and 374–78; —, *VD* 11 (1931), pp. 33–37 and P. Szczygiel, *Das Buch Job*, (HS V.1), Bonn: Hanstein, 1931. For a good discussion of the strophic system underlying Szczygiel's commentary see Möller (1955), pp. 43–44 (and cf. also STR, pp. 61–63).

4 Recent developments

We may turn now to an overview of the more recent 'developments' in the research into strophic structure in the book of Job. The word 'developments' is written in parenthesis here because in the last 50 years very few new perspectives have been advanced in this area. And we must recognize that at present not many scholars of the Hebrew Bible are prepared to analyse the speeches in the book of Job according to a rigorously applied system of strophic structures. Of the few who have made such an attempt I mention Möller (1955) and De Wilde (1981), whose positions have already been reviewed above (in sections 1.2 and 2 respectively). Nevertheless, in the last decades there have been other researchers who, whether in commentaries or in one or more articles, have attempted to discern the strophic structures of the speeches in the book of Job. Their perspectives must also be brought to attention.

4.1 E.J. Kissane

One exegete who in his commentaries continually attempted to solve the problem of strophic structure in Hebrew poetry is *E.J. Kissane.*[1] The problem of regular strophic structure is, according to Kissane, 'one of the most disputed questions' in the area of Hebrew poetry.[2] After briefly summarizing and rejecting the strophic theories of Bickell and Zenner, Kissane defends his own system in his Job commentary as being much simpler and more natural. This system is only an application of the fundamental law that 'the strophe, like the paragraph in prose, consists of a group of verses which develop the same thought'.[3] As a result Kissane's strophes vary in length from three to seven lines. These strophes can be arranged within the poem in two different ways: (a) all the strophes can be of the same length; (b) the strophes can have a length variation of one line within a given poem, in which case the strophes are arranged alternately. In this case the following sort of patterns emerge: 3.4.3.4 etc., 5.6.5.6 etc., or 6.7.6.7 etc. The most noteworthy aspect which Kissane believes can be demonstrated, is the consistency which appears to characterize the strophic patterns used in the debates of Job and his partners-in-dialogue. Job's responses to Eliphaz always show the alternating strophic scheme 6.7.6.7 etc. His answers to Zophar show the alternating 5.6.5.6 scheme, and Bildad is answered in strophes consisting of six lines. Eliphaz and Zophar speak in strophes of five lines each, while Bildad only uses the three-line strophe. Somewhat more variation is found in the Elihu-speeches and in the final chapters, where God himself speaks.[4]

---

[1] See E.J. Kissane, *The Book of Job*, Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1939 (New York, 1946); —, *The Book of Isaiah*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1941–43; —, *The Book of Psalms*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1953–54.

[2] Kissane (1939), p. lvi.

[3] Kissane (1939), p. lvii. According to Kissane the Hebrew poetic line is constructed of two, and sometimes three cola. In general the masoretic arrangement of the verses is trustworthy, but in some instances two consecutive tricola are grouped as three bicola (e.g., in 29,15–17) and *vice versa* (1939, pp. liv–lvi).

4.2 W.A. Irwin

In his strophic analysis of the book of Job, *W.A. Irwin*[5] built, in a certain sense, upon the results achieved by Ch.F. Kraft in his dissertation on the strophic structure in the Psalms.[6] This study is appealed to in regard to the assertion that structural units in Hebrew poetry are only seldom indicated by formal markers. In fact, according to Irwin such markers are totally absent in the book of Job, and 'the logical separation of the contents' is the only criterion for strophic analysis.[7] Thanks to the relatively large scale of the poems in the book of Job this material lends itself extremely well to research into the structure of Hebrew poetry. For that reason the phenomenon of strophes which are grouped together to form larger units, particularly lends itself to such study. In agreement with Kraft these units are termed by Irwin as 'stanzas'. Studied for their structure are, in this order, Job 19 20 3–18 (21) 22 (23–24).

As a result of this research Irwin comes to the following conclusions:

a) The occurence of both two-line and three-line strophes throughout the dialogues is evident, but the two-line strophes predominate.

b) Usually the poetic line is a bicolon, but the tricolic line must also be seriously considered, especially so when appearing in a more or less regular pattern.

c) In general the strophes are joined together in stanzas. These stanzas are 'of pure form'; that is to say, the stanzas consist of either solely two-line or three-line strophes. Transition from one strophe form to another always coincides with a caesura between the stanzas.

d) Within a given speech the stanzas are almost without exception of equal length.[8] It is supposed to be noteworthy that in most cases a balance should exist between stanzas composed of 'couplets' and stanzas composed of 'triads'. Accordingly, in a given poem three two-line strophes can occur along with two three-line strophes. Irwin thus produces schematic patterns such as these examples: 2|4×2|4×2|4×2 (chs. 19 and 22); but also 3.3|3.3|2.2.2|3 (ch. 8).

---

[4] See Kissane (1939), pp. lix–lx.

[5] W.A. Irwin, 'Poetic Structure in the Dialogue of Job', *JNES* 5 (1946), pp. 26–39.

[6] Ch.F. Kraft, *The Strophic Structure of Hebrew Poetry as illustrated in the First Book of the Psalter*, Chicago (Illinois): Private Edition, 1938. For a summary of this study see STR, pp. 74–77.

[7] Irwin (1946), column 26a.

[8] Cf. Löhr (see above, section 2).

e) 'A perplexing feature of the poem is the existence of a considerable number of isolated lines of excellent poetic form and not inappropriate content'.[9] In this category must be considered 3,6b–c.23 6,14 15,6 19,4 22,12 (?). This is probably a characteristic of the original author's style, 'a sort of artistic release from the regularity of his structure'.[10]

4.3 J. Herz

In an article entitled 'Formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Problem des Hiobbuches' *J. Herz* was of the opinion that he could improve upon the conclusions of Kautzsch (1910), Volz (1921) and Hertzberg (1950) with regard to the strophic structure of the book of Job, by virtue of the results of his own research.[11] According to Herz, as a rule in Hebrew poetry a certain number of cola (usually four or eight, three or six, less frequently five or seven) are connected to form uniform strophes. The strophic boundaries are always clearly recognizable because almost without exception they correspond 'mit den Sinnzäsuren des Textes'.[12] For the speeches in the book of Job Herz attempts for example to make the following schemes acceptable: 3×4|3×4|3×4 (ch. 3); 12×6 (chs. 4–5); 8×12 (chs. 6–7 and 9–10); 10×6 (ch. 15).

4.4 P.W. Skehan

In light of what has already been discussed in section 3 above, it is noteworthy that the critics I have so far dealt with in this section should have said virtually nothing concerning the use of formal indications, stylistic devices, or poetic indicators which might confirm or support an analysis of strophes in the poetry of the book of Job. Irwin as much as flatly denied that such formal devices exist. We find more attention paid to this dimension of the strophic structure of the Job dialogues in the articles written by

---

[9] Irwin (1946), column 38a.

[10] Irwin (1946), column 38b.

[11] J. Herz, 'Formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Problem des Hiobbuches', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig* 3 (1953–54), pp. 157–62.

[12] Herz (1953–54), column 157b.

P.W. Skehan.[13] This scholar builds upon Kissane's commentary as a starting point. But Skehan attempts to combine Kissane's conclusions about strophe with a new conception of the macrostructure of the speeches in the first cycle (chs. 4–14). Thus, the formal aspects of strophic structuring once again are allowed a function in the analysis.

Skehan observes that the positive results of Kissane's study of strophic structure in the book of Job have not nearly been done justice by later scholars. Skehan thinks in particular of the conclusions regarding three-line strophes in Bildad's speeches, five-line strophes from Eliphaz, and the observation that the responses of Job to Eliphaz always follow the same strophic pattern.[14] However, one important principle in the first cycle was missed by Kissane. The speeches of Eliphaz and Job in chs. 4–14 are deliberately structured as alphabetic poems. In other words, their structure is based upon the alphabetic acrostic in which the poem can contain 22 or 23 lines. Thus, according to Skehan, the first speech of Eliphaz has a fundamental pattern of 22.23+1 lines (4,2–5,2|5,3–26+5,27); the response of Job is judged to display a structure with 22+4.3+23 lines (6,2–23+24–27|28–30+7,1–21; 6,24–30 forms the transition from the one poem to the next). Job's response to Bildad has a basic pattern of 23.11.22 lines (9,2–24|9,25–10,1a|10,1b–22; the eleven lines in 9,25–10,1a form exactly a 'half' poem). Job's reply to Zophar shows a pattern of 22+2.3+22.23 lines (12,2–13,2|13,3–27|14,1–22; the first two poems are connected by an 'extra, transitional, five-line grouping' in 13,1–5).[15]

The alphabetising character of these chapters is reinforced, according to Skehan, by the poet's use of 'quasi-acrostic devices', which to a certain extent serve as external markers of the alphabetic units and strophes. Accordingly, the repetition of a particular letter at the beginning of a series of lines can serve to delineate a sense-unit; in the strophes 9,13–15, 22–24 and 29–31, for example, each line begins with an ’. Some of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet are more appropriate for this purpose than others. The first and the last letter of the alphabet (’ and *t*) were of course particularly useful. The fact that the author of 5,8 allows almost every word to begin with an ' may then be seen as a deliberate indication of the beginning of a new strophe; cf. too 5,17. It is of course no coincidence either that the last line of the same poem begins with a *t* (see *tbw'* in 5,26). But also the *l* (the first letter of the second half of the alphabet), the *p* (compare Pss. 25,22 and 34,23) and the *h* appear to fill a particular function in this connection. However, according to Skehan, such formal indicators of strophic structure are of a supplementary nature and not really important. Skehan too emphasizes: 'always, the sense must be the governing test, for which the external devices can only be suggestive'.[16]

---

[13] P.W. Skehan, 'Strophic Patterns in the Book of Job', *CBQ* 23 (1961), pp. 125–42 (we find here a strophic analysis of Job 3–27); —, 'Job's Final Plea (Job 29–31) and the Lord's Reply (Job 38–41)', *Biblica* 45 (1964), pp. 51–61. Both studies reproduced in: P.W. Skehan, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQ Monograph Series 1), Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1971, pp. 96–113 and 114–23 respectively. The articles by Skehan form the basis for the strophic divisions in NAB.

[14] Skehan (1971), p. 96.

[15] Cf. Peters (1928), p. 74*: 'Auch die alphabetisierenden Abschnitte (13,28–14,22 16,17–17,16 27,2–23 28,1–22) sind sicher kein Zufall'; on this rhetorical phenomenon see further part II, 13.6 n. 6.

In Skehan's opinion, from ch. 15 onward the poet no longer makes use of the alphabetising structure in the internal arrangement of the speeches. But he does suggest the presence in various places of the so-called 'quasi-acrostic devices'. In the second cycle, in the Eliphaz-speech we once again encounter primarily the five-line strophe, with Bildad three-line strophes, and Zophar speaks, as was the case in ch. 11, in six-line strophes. The replies of Job also continue the line begun in the first cycle. The strophic analysis of the third cycle of speeches between Job and his friends, according to Skehan, is somewhat more problematic than was the case in the preceding chapters. Nevertheless, the speeches in chs. 22–27 still follow 'the conventions already established'.[17]

In his article treating the last chapters of the book of Job (1964), Skehan defended the position that both chs. 29–31 ('Job's final plea') and chs. 38–41 ('the Lord's reply') consist of three major literary units, which framework is comparable to the tripartite structure of chs. 9–10 and 12–14. The fundamental structural scheme of Job 29–31 is 33.22.40, and God's answer has the foundational scheme of 36.34.50. The first two sections of this response (chs. 38–39) taken together total precisely 70 poetic lines. This total, according to Skehan, like the 40 lines of Job 31 and the 50 lines of Job 40,7–41,26, is deliberately intended by the poet.

The articles by Skehan had a considerable influence on American scholars, who studied the strophic structures in the book of Job.[18]

---

[16] Skehan (1971), p. 98.

[17] Skehan (1971), p. 111.

[18] See R.A.F. MacKenzie and R.E. Murphy, 'Job', in R.E. Brown a.o. (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Englewood Cliffs (New Jersey): Geoffrey Chapman, 2nd edn 1990 (first edn 1968), pp. 466–88, esp. column 468a; R.E. Murphy, *Wisdom Literature: Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes and Esther* (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 13), Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1981; and cf. n. 13 above.

4.5 The commentaries: Terrien, Fohrer, Horst, Van Selms, Clines

In this connection I also call attention to a number of recent Job commentaries in which attempts are made to divide the speeches into more or less uniform sections. What these commentaries all have in common is the fact that their authors no longer lay a more or less crystallized strophic system upon the dialogues.

S.L. Terrien is convinced that the writer of the book of Job manifests exceptional skill in the area of strophic structure. Especially in the exchange between Job and Eliphaz can be seen the tightly-knit architectonic structure which he has provided.[19]

G. Fohrer, in his commentary, admits the presence of strophes as 'stilistische Abschnitte', but 'Strophen im metrischen Sinn' (in which the corresponding verses are continually similar to each other in a metrical sense) can seldom be proved. Nevertheless, these stylistic units are distinguishable not only in a logical sense, but there are frequently also 'äussere Merkmale' at play.[20] Furthermore, it is striking that the units into which Fohrer divides the speeches very often consist of an equal number of poetic lines. This is true for example of Job 4–5 (structure: 9×5), 6–7 (structure: 5×3 and 8×4), 8 (structure: 7×3), 10 (structure: 4×5) and 13–14 (structure: 17×3).[21]

Unfortunately *F. Horst* was not able to complete his commentary on the book of Job. So we do not know precisely what conclusions he would have drawn regarding the strophic schemes he had found.[22] It seems to me, though, that Horst would have been able to identify with Fohrer's distinction between strophes as 'stilistische Abschnitte' and 'Strophen im metrischen Sinn'.[23] With Horst too we often encounter series of 'strophes' with equal numbers of poetic lines; for example in Job 6 (structure: 3.3|3.3|8|3.3.3), 7 (structure: 4×3 and 3×4), 9 (structure: 3.3.3.7.7.7.4), 10 (structure: 7.5.5.5) and 11 (structure: 4×3).

---

[19] S.L. Terrien, *Job* (CAT 13), Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963, esp. pp. 33–34. Many of the divisions proposed in Terrien's commentary are accepted in TOB.

[20] G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob* (KAT 16), Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963, esp. p. 55. For the rest, precisely what Fohrer intends with respect to these external indicators is not immediately evident. He does reject Skehan's starting points regarding strophic structure (p. 55 n. 9).

[21] Fohrer assumes the position that in the dialogues almost exclusive use is made of the 'zweigliedrige Langvers' (the bicolon). Where this is not the case either a later gloss, or loss of a verse portion, must be assumed. Following precisely in Fohrer's path is F. Hesse, *Hiob* (ZBK AT 14), Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1978.

[22] See F. Horst, *Hiob* (BK XVI.1), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968. The commentary ends at ch. 19.

[23] Cf. also F. Horst, 'Die Kennzeichen der hebräischen Poesie', *ThR* 21 (1953), pp. 97–121; esp. 119–21. In my opinion the positions of Fohrer and Horst are strongly influenced by the article by J. Begrich, 'Zur hebräischen Metrik', *ThR* 4 (1932), pp. 67–89 (esp.

By virtue of observations first made in Job 3, *A. van Selms* states that the component parts of the speeches in chs. 3–31 generally demonstrate a uniformity in length.[24] But, according to Van Selms, this does not mean that one can proceed to a division into regular strophes. The pericopes into which the speeches can be divided usually contain from ten to twelve poetic lines.[25] Nevertheless, to support his divisions into pericopes Van Selms frequently points to certain grammatical factors or to other considerations not strictly related to the thought-content. Thus, he sees his analysis of Job 4–5 in a certain sense confirmed by the fact that the first pericope begins with a question, the second with the emphatic 'and to me' (4,12), the third with an imperative (5,1), the fourth with a strong word for 'but' (5,8), and the fifth with anacrusis (5,17).[26]

Approaching the problem of strophic structure in the speeches of the book of Job, *D.J.A. Clines* is very careful. This exegete does not state without reservation that the poet of the book of Job composed in strophes, neither flatly denies that this author was consciously shaping his poems in this way.[27] The exegesis of every speech is systematically preceeded by a consideration of its strophic structure. In this context Clines generally concludes that the strophic structure of the speeches is pretty clear. And this critic sometimes points to several formal devices to support his strophic observations; see, e.g., the treatment of ch. 3 (*lmh* in vv. 11 and 20 is a marker of beginnings, and there are 'very definite' marks of closure too), and the reference to the transition marker *w'lh* in 10,13. Tricola can also occur in a concluding position (chs. 12–14).[28] In ch. 19 disjunctions between strophes are generally discerned by an analysis of the direction of address. In connection with his strophic analysis of chs. 9–10 Clines concludes that 'detection of strophic structures is not an arbitrary exercise' (p. 224). In most speeches a 'basic strophic pattern' with strophes of three lines is established. Ch. 20 is judged to display predominantly substrophes of four lines. From 9,25 onwards the five-line strophe is most frequent, as is the case

---

pp. 83–89; and see now STR, pp. 90–91).

[24] See A. van Selms, *Job*, 2 vols. (POT), Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1982–83.

[25] Van Selms (1982), p. 82.

[26] Van Selms (1982), p. 60. In addition see p. 74 (for chs. 6–7), pp. 82–83 (for chs. 9–10), p. 99 (for ch. 11).

[27] See D.J.A. Clines, *Job 1–20* (Word Biblical Commentary 17), Dallas (Texas): Word Books, 1989, p. xxxi.

[28] In establishing the length of a strophe, Clines departs from the bicolon as fundamental building block.

in chs. 16–17 (but it is noted that other strophic divisions remain possible; p. 376). As to ch. 19 only Clines explicitly states that the strophic structure does not display a regular pattern.

4.6 E.C. Webster

In the articles which *E.C. Webster* dedicated to the study of strophic structure in the book of Job[29] the purpose is not primarily to prove that the book contains a strophic structure; that it does is more or less assumed. Webster is much more interested in demonstrating that at the level of strophic structure there is a certain continuity in the speeches of each of Job's friends (cf. Kissane), and also that the overall structure of the dialogues and monologues bears testimony to a well-developed pattern. According to Webster a speech can consist of more than one poem. A poem is always constructed of a series of strophes which, with a few exceptions, contain three, four or five poetic lines.[30] Particular attention is given to strophes which develop a specific thought by using a concentric ordering of poetic lines (e.g., 3,20–23). Webster's research proceeds on the basis of R.A.F. Mackenzie's strophic divisions in The Jerome Biblical Commentary (1968), which in turn draws upon Skehan's results (see above, section 4.4). In this manner he comes to the conclusion that quantitative relationships exist between the speeches, which come to expression through the number of strophes present within a speech.[31]

These quantitative relationships can be described as follows:

a) In the first and third cycles Job's speeches, as measured by the total number of strophes, are much longer than the accusational speeches to which they respond; in the second cycle accusation and response are of approximately the same length.

---

[29] E.C. Webster, 'Strophic Patterns in Job 3–28', *JSOT* 26 (1983), pp. 33–60; —, 'Strophic Patterns in Job 29–42', *JSOT* 30 (1984), pp. 95–109.

[30] It is remarkable that this critic does not include strophes of two lines. Webster bases his judgment upon an analysis of Job 39 and 3. With a poetic line he thinks of a combination of two or three cola (1983, pp. 33–34).

[31] Compare in this regard De Moor's assertion that the structure of Hebrew (and Ugaritic) poetry is determined more by the number of strophes within a formal unit (De Moor speaks here of a 'canticle') than by the total number of poetic lines of which the strophes and the 'canticles' are constructed; see J.C. de Moor, 'The Art of Versification in Ugarit and Israel II', *UF* 10 (1978), pp. 200–17, and cf. by the same author in *Orientalia* 53 (1984), p. 283 and in *Orientalia* 55 (1986), p. 46. See now also M.C.A. Korpel and J.C. de Moor, 'Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 1–61.

b) The speeches of Eliphaz in the first and the second cycles have an identical length (nine strophes); the same holds good for Bildad (six strophes). The speeches of Job become continually longer in the first cycle (6, 15, 15 and 21 strophes); in the second cycle they show a concentric pattern (9, 7 and 9 strophes); in the third cycle they decline in length (12 and 8 strophes).

c) The progression of the poems in the dialogues shows a 'flowing pattern ... rising or falling from a base length of six strophes to a poem'.[32] The first half of the first cycle (chs. 3–7), for example has, according to Webster, a 6|4.5|6|4.5|6 scheme. For the second half of the cycle he assumes a 6|7.8|6|7.8|6 scheme.

d) In the monologues (chs. 29–41), which are handled in Webster's second article (1984), there is no longer any talk of a 'flowing pattern'. The monologue of Job (chs. 29–31), and the answer of God (chs. 38–41), with their parallel, rising patterns, encase 'the balanced speeches of Elihu's interjection': 6.9.12|6.4×9|3.6.9.12.

4.7 E.B. Smick

In this context mention must also be made of the article by *E.B. Smick* about special rhetorical aspects in the book of Job.[33] Smick sees 'the drive towards symmetry as an important esthetic principle of Old Testament poetry' (p. 91; cf. Webster about concentric ordering of lines). The author of Job, according to Smick, 'displays a literary genius that matches his theological profundity' (p. 87). The book of Job as a whole is supposed to be constructed on a basic a.b.a' pattern with ch. 28 as the apex. Such a balanced structure, however, can also be discerned within individual speeches and smaller pericopes. Thus, Job 13,28–14,6 is judged to display an x.a.b.c.a'.b'-pattern with 14,4 as the apex (element c). In ch. 27 vv. 13 and 23 form an inclusio which embraces vv. 14–22. Ch. 29 is deemed to be a 'classic example of Semitic rhetoric with all the elements of good symmetrical style' (p. 92). The symmetric pattern of this poem can be displayed as a.b.c.a'.b' (vv. 2–6.7–11.12–17.18–20.21–25). This analysis is purely based on thematic considerations.

---

[32] Webster (1983), p. 58.

[33] E.B. Smick, 'Architectonics, Structured Poems, and Rhetorical Devices in the Book of Job', in W.C. Kaiser and R.F. Youngblood (eds.), *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1986, pp. 87–104.

The emphasis which is laid by Smick on symmetric structures is typical for the modern approach to Hebrew poetry in general.[34]

---

[34] See, e.g., W.G.E. Watson, 'Chiastic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry', in J.W. Welch (ed.), *Chiasmus in Antiquity. Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981, pp. 118–168; L.C. Bezuidenhout, *Struktuur en strekking van die boek Job*, DD-proefskrif, Universiteit van Pretoria, 1986, passim; M.C.A. Korpel and J.C. de Moor, 'Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 54–61; Th. Lescow, *Das Stufenschema. Untersuchungen zur Struktur alttestamentlicher Texte* (BZAW 211), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992; and many other structural studies and individual observations.

5 Critical evaluations

If the description of the various theories of strophic structure, as they have been delineated in the preceeding sections, has created the impression that researchers have never fully attained a consensus about the strophic structure in the book of Job, then the impression created is in harmony with the facts. To be sure, in a number of chapters of the book of Job the opinions regarding strophic structure do not vary significantly. But there is an equal number of speeches, or large segments of speeches, where any consensus among scholars seems to be far down the road. Seen in that light, it is not so amazing that to this day commentaries and translations of the book of Job should be published without the slightest attempt being made to present the speeches in larger or smaller pericopes, to make them reflect the rhetorical framework of the poems. Similarly, there have always been scholars who passed criticism on the attempts of their colleagues to discover a well-thought-out system in the macrostructure of Hebrew poetry.

F.W.C. Umbreit[1] was one of the first to openly express his doubts concerning the importance of Köster's discovery. He did not think it at all likely that a poet as great as the writer of Job would allow himself to be confined by precise, stiff, strophic patterns. In his estimation such poetry would drop to the level of a mass-produced alphabetic psalm. Köster might assert that the table of contents with which he began his treatment of the individual speeches was inextricably connected to the strophic divisions, but every commentator's description of the content would simply follow his own perspective anyway. And, where then is 'die eigentliche Entdeckung einer formellen Regel, deren der Verf. sich rühmt?'[2] With recourse to a discussion of Job 27–28 Umbreit attempted to demonstrate that Köster's discovery was more likely to obscure than to clarify the true meaning of these chapters. Köster's view of ch. 28 he considered to be particularly disappointing because it totally missed the significance of the repeated question in vv. 12 and 20 (where shall divine wisdom be found?), which is not only the theme of the whole chapter but of the entire book of Job.

At the 'oriëntalistencongres' of 1883 (Leiden), approximately 30 years after the appearance of his commentary on Job, Schlottmann systematically exposed his principles of strophic structure, which were dependent upon Köster's views.[3] Budde and Kautzsch took advantage of this opportunity to vent their scepticism regarding every attempt to discover precise rules regarding strophes in Hebrew poetry.[4] In response to Schlottmann's speech, *E. Kautzsch* spoke explicitly about the alleged strophic structure of the book of Job. In Kautzsch's opinion the suggestion that the poets consciously attempted to incorporate an alternation between strophes of two and three poetic lines, for example, was not at all in accord with the loftiness of Hebrew poetry (compare Umbreit). 'Solche Strophenschemata aber, wie sie besonders den einzelnen Capiteln des Buches Hiob vorangestellt zu werden pflegen, wie etwa 6.6.8.8.7.6, halte ich für reine Selbsttäuschung'.[5] Almost every commentary which appears promises anew to finally solve the problem of strophic structure, but to this day no two are in harmony in counting strophes!

---

[1] F.W.C. Umbreit, 'Die neuesten Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Hiob', *ThStKr* 13 (1840), pp. 229–33.

[2] Umbreit (1840), p. 230.

[3] See K. Schlottmann, 'Über den Strophenbau in der hebräischen Poesie', in *Actes du Sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes*, vol. 2, Leiden, 1885, pp. 473–92;

K. Budde also took this opportunity to express his view that the attempts to find a strophic structure in Hebrew poetry are based on unproven and unlikely theories.[6] Budde was of the same opinion in his Job commentary.[7] Since Köster the presence of strophes in Hebrew poetry was assumed by almost everyone as being virtually self-evident. That was the source of a puzzling mistake, namely that 'Sinnesabschnitte' and 'metrische Einheiten' were simply equated. Budde's reservation regarding the presupposed strophes then was aimed at the fact 'daß man eine neue, höhere Formeinheit behauptet oder unbefangen voraussetzt, ohne ein neues Formmittel—wie es sonst bei Strophen in regelmäßig wiederkehrender Abwechselung des Metrums, der Zeilenlänge, des Endreims usw. vorliegt—aufzuweisen oder auch nur zu begehren'.[8] Moreover, the search for strophes had led to damaging of Hebrew poetry (among others by Bickell) and also to a total overlooking of the parallelisms between members of a verse (for example by Delitzsch and Merx). And precisely this parallelism, which welds the poetic lines into cohesive units, inhibits, according to Budde, the formation of higher structural units. The parallel verse is already a sort of strophe. In fact, the higher units in the book of Job are 'nicht künstlich abgemessen', but rather, they develop in a totally free and natural way. The fact that in some cases (for example chs. 3 and 30) the use of rhetorical devices results in a clear division into approximately equal units, does not detract from this argument. In Budde's opinion it is simply an additional

---

regarding Schlottmann's Job commentary see section 1.2 above.

[4] See *Actes du Sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes*, vol. 1, Leiden, 1884, pp. 91–95.

[5] *Actes...* vol. 1 (1884), p. 93.

[6] For a summary of Budde's position see STR, p. 36.

[7] See K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob* (HK II.1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn 1913, pp. VIII–IX.

[8] Budde (1913), p. VIII.

argument against continuously appearing strophes.

Budde may be considered one of the most outspoken critics of the advocates of strophic theories. But there appeared additional major Job commentaries in the beginning of this century in which the sole clue to the poetic nature of the dialogues was the fact that they were printed in the form of the poetic line. And such commentaries did not appear only in German either. *P. Dhorme*, in his famous commentary, finally discussed the poetry of the book of Job without making any appeal to strophic division.[9] With regard to the problem which is my concern, Dhorme wished to distinguish two questions, namely the question of the presence of strophes and that of the internal realationship between the strophes. He does not wish to deny that the parallelism of Hebrew poetry also frequently unites two or three poetic lines into higher units. But it seldom occurs that by this means a whole row of uniform 'strophes' is produced. Repetitions of words, an argument sometimes appealed to as a criterion for strophic division, are frequently deceiving. In this connection Dhorme referred to a discussion which he had held with Condamin a few years prior to the appearance of his commentary. At the occasion he had called attention to texts such as Job 33,15–30. The poetic lines which make explicit the major motifs of the particular pericope (vv. 18, 22, 24, 28 and 30), appear with small variations at irregular intervals. The poet apparently felt no need to introduce any degree of uniformity into the length of the strophes.[10] Furthermore, a closer look suggests that the 'bâtisseurs de strophes' are difficult to make to agree with each other, to say nothing of the interference in the text by Bickell and Duhm for the sake of the construction of their tetrastich strophes. 'Au fond, la répartition qui se rapprocherait le plus de celle des vers et hémistiches de la poésie hébraique, c'est la disposition en *laisses* ou *couplets* d'inégale longueur, telle qu'on la trouve dans les Chansons de Geste'.[11]

Another exegete from the beginning of this century who must be mentioned in this context is *E. König*. There is no doubt, says König, that in the poetic sections of Job 'Sinnesabschnitte' can be distinguished.[12] Job's complaint in ch. 3, where the development of the thought clearly proceeds in three sections (vv. 3-10, 11–19, 20–26), is already immediately a good example of this. In the poetry of the book of Job many more pericopes can be identified which 'wegen ihren logischen Beziehung zu ihrer Umgebung und wegen ihres ungefähr gleichen Umfangs unter den Begriff der Sinnstrophen fallen; 14,1–6.7–12.13–17 usw.'[13] But by their very nature the dialogues can only be divided into smaller units on the grounds of internal thought progression, and not into formal pericopes of equal length.[14] Also in his analysis of ch. 28 König saw no reason to support a strophic structure. The refrain-like questions of vv. 12 and 20 could scarcely be viewed as transition verses, contrary to the strophic divisions suggested by Duhm and Löhr for this chapter.[15]

---

[9] See P. Dhorme, *Le livre de Job* (Études bibliques), Paris: Gabalda, 1926, esp. pp. CXLIX–CLI.

[10] Cf. P. Dhorme, 'A propos d'une théorie strophique (2)', *RB* 33 (1924), p. 416.

[11] Dhorme (1926), p. CL. That Dhorme was not quickly finished with the problem of the strophe in Job is also evident from his discussion of the commentary by C.J. Ball; see *RB* 32 (1923), pp. 446–49, where this question receives ample attention. Here Dhorme compares the form of Hebrew poetry to the swinging of a cradle, 'dont les oscillations sont plus ou moins rapides suivant que la main de la mère intervient plus ou moins énergiquement' (1923, p. 448).

[12] See E. König, *Das Buch Hiob*, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929, esp. pp. 14–16.

In his discussion of recent literature pertaining to the book of Job it is primarily the great diversity of opinions regarding strophic structure which causes *C. Kuhl* to express his doubts as to the merit of the entire search for strophes.[16] And in the more recent commentaries by Pope, Gordis, Habel and Hartley we encounter the same scepticism concerning the presupposition of regularly repeating combinations of poetic lines in Hebrew poetry. To obtain a strictly executed, uniform, strophic pattern in a Hebrew poem of any length almost invariably demands, in *M.H. Pope*'s opinion, 'too much cutting and patching' to be convincing.[17] *R. Gordis* wishes only to speak of 'stanzas' in the relatively rare instances when a refrain is used in such a manner that it is repeated at regular intervals. Job 28, where the refrain of vv. 12 and 20 originally could have stood at the beginning of this 'Hymn to Wisdom' as well, provides one such example.[18] Where a comparable refrain cannot be identified, however, the strophic theory is doomed to failure. It is always foiled by the stubborn fact that the assumed units are not of the same length. Nor does Kissane's attempt to find a regular pattern in the 'irregular' strophes earn approval from Gordis. Kissane too is forced to make arbitrary divisions in the text, which leads to divorcing poetic lines which clearly belong together and the natural thought progression of the text must often be ignored. Gordis can finally do no better than concur with the judgment expressed by G.B. Gray already at the beginning of this century: 'If we use the term "strophe" it must mean simply a verse paragraph of indeterminate length uncontrolled by any formal artistic scheme'.[19]

---

[13] König (1929), p. 16.

[14] König already came to these conclusions in his *Hebräische Rhythmik*, Halle, 1914, p. 61.

[15] König (1929), p. 283. For a discussion of Schlögl's theory see König (1929), p. 16.

[16] Kuhl (1953), p. 185; cf. n. 2 above.

[17] M.H. Pope, *Job* (AB 15), Garden City (New York): Doubleday, 3rd edn 1973, p. LIII.

[18] See R. Gordis, *The Book of Job* (Moreshet Series 2), New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978, pp. 506–507; cf. R. Gordis, 'The Structure of Biblical Poetry', in *Poets, Prophets and Sages*, Bloomington (Indiana), 1971, pp. 83–85.

Finally, the observation can be made that *N.C. Habel*'s conclusions are somewhat more complex than criticisms mentioned thus far, and his position may rightly be seen to typify the most recent developments regarding the problem of strophic structure. On the one hand Habel has little confidence in traditional strophic research. He speaks of 'the futility of dividing the poetic passages of Job into stanzas or strophes of relatively equal length based on a common theme or structure'.[20] But it is noteworthy that Habel believes his point can be demonstrated with reference to Job 3. The usual division of this chapter into three pericopes of approximately equal length (vv. 3–10, 11–19, 20–26) is alleged to rest upon a 'mechanical division' of the text. By virtue of a detailed study of formal (!) and thematic phenomena he concludes that only two 'major literary units' can be identified, vv. 3–10 and 11–26. So, on the other hand in the book of Job it is clearly justifiable to speak of 'distinctive literary structures and designs' (p. 46). Thus, under the heading 'Design', the structure of every major literary unit receives special attention in Habel's commentary. In general this structure is very clearly demonstrable from certain themes and thoughts. At the same time, however, this exegete is not always certain whether the structure he discusses is deliberately intended by the poet!

A common balanced arrangement, according to Habel, is what he calls the 'palistrophe'. A very important poetic line, or group of lines, is placed in the exact center of the a.b.c.b'.a'-pattern typical of the 'palistrophe' (cf. Webster and Smick in sections 4.6–7 above). That is the case in 19,21–29, for example, where reference to the redeemer (vv. 25–26a) constitutes the precise center of the thematic palistrophe. Such a balanced arrangement also determines larger literary untis as chs. 29 and 31 (p. 46). Another frequently recurring stylistic device is inclusio. Here it is precisely the beginning and the end of a literary unit which have an important function in the explanation of a pericope.

---

[19] G.B. Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, New York: Ktav Pub. House, 2nd edn 1972, p. 192 (London, 1915). See now also J.E. Hartley, *The Book of Job* (NICOT), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988, p. 35.

[20] N.C. Habel, *The Book of Job* (OTL), London: SCM Press, 1985, p. 47; similarly L.C. Bezuidenhout, *Struktuur en strekking van die boek Job*, DD-proefskrif, Universiteit van Pretoria, 1986, p. 14; D.W. Cotter, *A Study of Job 4–5 in the Light of Contemporary Literary Theory* (SBL Dissertation Series 124), Atlanta (Georgia): Scholars Press, 1992, p. 92; and see also J.L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry. Parallelism and its History*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981, p. 72 n. 19 (on Ps. 107).

Although Habel himself seems to suggest that his appraisal of Hebrew poetry and the traditional pursuit of strophic structure are more or less mutually exclusive, in my opinion, that is not really the case. This may be seen from the clarifying analysis of ch. 7 offered by Habel. In contrast to the predominant approaches he finds ‘three balanced units’ (vv. 1–8, 9–16, 17–21). The structures of these units appear to a large measure to run parallel. Moreover, he concludes (in my opinion correctly) that within these major units, repeatedly two masoretic verses form a minor sub-unit (with a few aberrations in the third section).[21] Accordingly, research into the strophic structure of the book of Job, precisely by means of one of the most recent commentaries on this book, has been confronted with new challenges.[22]

---

[21] For a further analysis of ch. 7 see part II, 6.

[22] For the structural approach by L.C. Bezuidenhout (*op. cit.*, 1986) see part IV, 7.6.

PART II

Job 3
and the First Speech-Cycle (Job 4–14)

1 A methodology of rhetorical analysis

1.1 The need for a 'fresh' approach

At first sight it might appear rather pedantic to underline the need for a fresh approach at a time when the structural analysis of the Hebrew Bible is still in the making. Nevertheless, I would like to propound four reasons to support the necessity for a renewed investigation of the rhetorical framework of Hebrew poetry. These reasons mostly have to do with the analysis of Hebrew poetry in general, but in what follows (parts II–V) they will primarily be illustrated on the basis of the poetry of the book of Job.

- ('Strophic' structure) To this very day the question of the strophic structure of Hebrew poetry is a matter of dispute. The historical survey in part I was an attempt to reveal this state of affairs as it affects the book of Job.[1] However, a close inspection of the strophic divisions proposed by various critics does reveal some consensus on the structure of several poems, or sections of poems, in the book of Job. This applies to chs. 3 (three units), 4 (four 5-line units), 5 (three units), 6,2–13 (four 3-line strophes), 8,2–13 (four 3-line strophes), 9,2–10 (three 3-line strophes), 10,3–22 (four 5-line units), 11,2–12 (four 3-line strophes), 14,1–12 (four 3-line strophes), 15,2–16 (three 5-line units; especially according to earlier interpretations), 18,2–13 (four 3-line strophes), 22,2–20 (2-line strophes), 30 (four almost identical units), 35 (four almost identical units), 36,2–15 (a sequence of three-line strophes interrupted by vv. 11–12), 38,4–15 (three 4-line units), 39,1–12 (three 4-line units).

---

[1] As to Hebrew poetry in general see STR, pp. 1–120.

In view of this state of affairs the strophic structure of the speeches in the book of Job has again been seriously investigated in the most recent commentary to this book by Clines.[2] It is nevertheless true that the consensus pointed out, is restricted to a limited number of poems, and only seldom extends to a poem as a whole. In this perspective it remains a fascinating question, how to deal with the remaining lines of those poems that only partially seem to show a strophic framework. And next, the question arises how to deal with those poems for which no scholarly agreement as to the strophic structure has been found up till now.

- (Formal devices) Around the turn of the century Budde already correctly observed that advocates of strophic structure in the book of Job did not appeal to formal devices—such as metre, length of verses, or rhyme—by which one strophe could be distinguished from the other.[3] Budde's view was right on target, and still is! Köster, the spiritual father of strophic investigation in Hebrew poetry, already stated that the book of Job, in particular, almost totally lacks formal devices, for example the refrain, that would aid in differentiating the strophes. This opinion, as we have seen in the previous part, was (unconsciously) taken over by Müller, Condamin, Kissane, and Irwin.[4] Thus Irwin states that 'the logical separation of the contents' is the only criterion for strophic analysis.[5] More recently Skehan tried to prove that the speeches of Eliphaz and Job in the first cycle of the dialogues show alphabetic patterns.[6] Here we are dealing with a formal device. However, to determine the size of a strophe, 'the sense must (always) be the governing test, for which the external devices can only be suggestive', according to Skehan.[7] And in the most recent articles on this subject by Webster (and Smick)[8] we again look in vain for the mention of the formal aspects of the supposed strophes. So Budde's criticism still holds good.

  One of the most intriguing results of our historical investigation is that the poetry of the book of Job is supposed to stand out from the poetry of the Hebrew Bible in general, e.g., the poetry of the Psalms and the prophets. That is, the poetry of the book of Job is supposed to lack the formal features that mark the strophes in the other poetic parts of the Hebrew Bible. This state of affairs constitutes another reason for a fresh approach, especially as far as the poetry of the book of Job is concerned. The above supposition does not in fact hold. Scholars like Köster, Müller and Condamin concluded too soon that the key they employed to solve the problem of strophic structure in Hebrew poetry in general did not fit the poetry of the book of Job.

---

[2] See part I, 4.5.
[3] See part I, 5.
[4] See part I, 3.2–3 and 4.1–2.
[5] Irwin (1946), column 26a.
[6] See part I, 4.4.
[7] Skehan (1971), p. 98.
[8] See part I, 4.6–7.

- (Strophes, canticles and cantos) Discussions about the strophic structure of Hebrew poetry are too often restricted to only one level of rhetorical structuring beyond the level of the lines. This is one explanation for the fact that there is a veritable tower of Babel on this subject. In the past, several scholars pointed out that the poetry of the book of Job is framed on more than one level above the line; see, e.g., the commentaries of Schlottmann, Dillmann, Peters.[9] This opinion will get due attention in the following structural analyses of the speeches.

  A Hebrew poem in the first place always divides into two or more main units of identical or approximately identical length. These main units I call 'cantos'.[10] The cantos in turn generally divide into two or more strophes. When the poem opens or closes with a canto that has no relationship with the main units as far as length is concerned, this canto may coincide with the strophe. Moreover, in poems of some length a structural level between the cantos and the strophes can frequently be discerned. Then, the cantos subdivide into units which I call canticles. In that case the canticles constitute the rhetorical bridge between the cantos and the strophes.

---

[9] See with regard to the strophic structure of the Psalms also J. Calès, *Le Livre des Psaumes*, 2 vols., Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1936; Ch.F. Kraft, *The Strophic Structure of Hebrew Poetry as illustrated in the First Book of the Psalter*, Chicago (Illinois): Private Edition, 1938; Th.P. Wahl, *Strophic structure of individual laments in Psalms Books I and II* (Ph.D. 1976 Union Theological Seminary), New York, 1977; Nic.H. Ridderbos, *Die Psalmen. Stilistische Verfahren und Aufbau. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Ps 1–41* (BZAW 117), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972. Cf. also A. Condamin, *Poèmes de la Bible—avec une Introduction sur la Strophique Hébraïque*, Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, 2nd edn 1933.

[10] Here I follow De Moor and the 'Kampen School' as far as terminology is concerned; see W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. viii, 41 and 44. In STR these units were termed 'stanzas'.

- (Starting point) Finally, recent study of the formal aspects of Hebrew poetry has largely concentrated on the building up of the line.[11] And when the macrostructure of the poetry of the Hebrew Bible is addressed, scholars generally move from the cola and lines to the higher structural levels of a composition.[12] This approach is partially based on the conviction that it should be easier to determine the length of the fundamental building blocks of the strophes and cantos—the cola and the lines—than the boundaries of the strophes and cantos themselves.[13] Moving from the fundamental building blocks to the higher structural units also seems the most logical way to proceed. It must be stressed, however, that the length of a colon and the structure of a Hebrew poetic line often depend on the overall structure of the poem in question. We are not dealing here with formal, poetic entities that can in principle be described apart from their context.[14] This is an important reason, I think, why there has been much confusion about the question of the length of the Hebrew poetic cola and lines. We must reckon with the possibility that the Hebrew poets were especially careful with and devoted much attention to the framing of

---

[11] See T. Collins, *Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry. A grammatical approach to the stylistic study of the Hebrew Prophets* (Studia Pohl: Series Maior 7), Rom: Biblical Institute Press, 1978; S.A. Geller, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry* (HSM 20), Missoula (Montana): Scholars Press, 1979; M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, Winona Lake (Indiana): Eisenbrauns, 1980; J.L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry. Parallelism and Its History*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981; A. Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985; W.G.E. Wason, 'Internal Parallelism in Classical Hebrew Verse', *Biblica* 66 (1985), pp. 365–84; —, 'Internal or half-line parallelism in Classical Hebrew Poetry', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 44–66; H. van Grol, *De Versbouw in het Klassieke Hebreeuws. Fundamentele Verkenningen. I: Metriek*, Amsterdam, 1986; D. Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism. A Trial Cut* (*'nt* I and Proverbs 2) (SupplVT 39), Leiden and New York: Brill, 1988; W.T.W. Cloete, *Versification and Syntax in Jeremiah 2–25. Syntactical Constraints in Hebrew Colometry* (SBL Dissertation Series 117), Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989; —, 'The Colometry of Hebrew Verse', *JNSL* 15 (1989), pp. 15–29.

[12] See M.C.A. Korpel and J.C. de Moor, 'Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 44–53; H.W.M. van Grol, 'Clause, Sentence and Versification. A Theoretical And Practical Exploration Of The Role Of Syntax In Versification, With Isaiah 5,1–7 As Example', in E. Talstra and A.L.H.M. van Wieringen (eds.), *A Prophet on the Screen* (Applicatio 9), Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1992, pp. 70–117; J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, 'The Role of Syntax In The Versification Of Is 65,13–25', in E. Talstra and A.L.H.M. van Wieringen (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 118–47. Cf. also J. Kim, *op. cit.*, pp. 120–21.

[13] Cf. M. O'Connor, *op. cit.*, p. 424; W.T.W. Cloete, *op. cit.* (1989), pp. 13–17 and *art. cit.* (1989), pp. 15–29.

[14] Cf. also Korpel and De Moor, *art. cit.*, pp. 4–14.

> their cantos (and canticles). When the skeleton of the cantos (and the canticles) of a poem can be established on formal and thematic grounds, it is often rather easy to analyse its strophic structure in the proper sense. From this perspective the strophic structure (and the problem of the lenght of the cola) becomes of 'secondary' importance. Therefore it is time, I think, to complement the traditional approach with another one, that takes its starting point in the overall structure of the composition. It is my firm belief that this neglected way of dealing with Hebrew poetry yields at least as many results, as does the more traditional one.[15] So, my approach to the rhetorical structures of the speeches in the book of Job will diverge from other approaches, by taking the overall structure of the poem as its starting point and by proceeding in principle from this overall structure (the cantos) to the lower levels of structuring, the strophes and the lines.

The book of Job lends itself very well to an investigation into the rhetorical structures of Hebrew poetry. In the first place, there is, for the most part, little discussion about the boundaries of the poems.[16] In the Hebrew text the beginning of a poem is generally explicitly marked by the announcement of a new speaker (*wy'n* PN *wy'mr*), which itself always coincides with the beginning of a new chapter.[17] Accordingly, the end of a given poem generally coincides with the end of a chapter. In some cases, however, a speech encompasses more than one chapter. This is the case, e.g., with the speeches of Eliphaz and Job in the first cycle and the speeches of Job in chs. 27–28 and 29–31. In these cases we are generally dealing with a speech which is built up out of more than one poem. The material content of the various poems within the speeches in question is mostly quite distinct, and therefore the the boundaries of these poems can already adequately be ascertained from the chapter divisions.[18] Then too, there is the great advantage that the boundaries of the lines are for the most part exactly demarcated by the masoretic verse divisions.[19] Finally, the length of the poems enables the student more than once to pursue the regular, rhetorical reasoning within a specific poem over the course of a fairly large amount of lines.[20]

---

[15] Cf. also Nic.H. Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, pp. 83–85. According to this scholar most exegetes, who are engaged on this problem, 'gehen eher von dem Ganzen eines Psalms aus und versuchen, den Psalm in Teile zu gliedern, die als Strophen bezeichnet werden können' (p. 84 n. 83); with reference to Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, vol. 2, 1962, p. 265.

[16] In any case, the same is true for the book of Psalms.

[17] Cf. S.A. Meier, *Speaking of Speaking* (SupplVT) 46, Leiden: Brill, 1992, pp. 167–69.

[18] Exceptions to this rule are chs. 15, 16–17, 25–26, 36–37 and 40–41. On the chapter divisions of the Hebrew Bible see E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992, p. 52.

[19] See about the structure of the Hebrew poetic line part VI, 2.1.

The major aim of this study is to investigate the poetic structures of the speeches in the book of Job. This aim partially corresponds to the purpose of my previous investigation into the strophes and the stanzas (cantos) which determine the rhetorical framework of the psalms (see STR). Nevertheless, there will be a slight shift in the perspective with which I approach my subject in this study. In my former investigation the question *whether* it is meaningful to look for strophes and cantos in Hebrew poetry was emphasized. I believe that I provided the basic evidence for such a deliberate framework in the poetry of the Hebrew Bible there. Now, the question that remains is *which* patterns emerge from a comparable investigation of the poetry of the book of Job.

Like my structural analyses of the psalms, this investigation of the poetic framework of the speeches in the book of Job will move along *four mutually complementary lines.* Together these lines constitute the method for this *rhetorical inquiry.*[21] I do not exclude the possibility that there are still other ways to explore the rhetorical structure of Hebrew poetry, such as its specific syntactical peculiarities.[22] The method presented here, however, yields a consistent picture of the structure of quite a few poems and makes it possible to systematically describe the rhetorical aspects of the overall design of Hebrew poetry; see part VI and cf. the results in STR.[23] It may tentatively be stated that with the application of this method the most important, rhetorical phenomena 'fall into place'.[24] On these grounds, I think that a sound rhetorical approach cannot ignore the analyses described below. Each of the four aspects is presented in a way which makes it possible, to provide in brief compass a large amount of information. In view of the fact that the analytical patterns are the same in each of the poems, I think it justified to present this information schematically and in a formalized way.[25] The sequence in which the several steps of the analysis is presented is somehow arbitrary and generally does not (and in view of the economy of presentation cannot) mirror the steps of the hermeneutic circle.[26] Now each of my four complementary lines of approach will briefly be explained.

---

[20] So also Irwin (1946), p. 26.

[21] See for the term 'rhetorical criticism' M. Kessler, 'A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism', in D.J.A. Clines, D.M. Gunn and A.J. Hauser (eds.), *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature* (JSOTS 19), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982, pp. 1–19. Kessler rightly observes that Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as "the art of discovering the best possible means of persuasion in regard to any subject whatever" still deserves attention. An obvious advantage of this definition is, according to Kessler, 'that it brings together the formal and the functional aspects' (see Kessler, p. 2); see furthermore J.J. Jackson and M. Kessler (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 1), Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania): The Pickwick Press, 1974; W. Wüllner, 'Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?', *CBQ* 49 (1987), pp. 448–63; P.R. House, 'The Rise and Current Status of Literary Criticism of the Old Testament', in P.R. House (ed.), *Beyond Form Criticism. Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 2), Winona Lake (Indiana): Eisenbrauns, 1992, pp. 3–22; M. West, 'Looking for the Poem: Reflections on the Current and Future Status of the Study of Biblical Hebrew Poetry', in P.R. House (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 423–31. For the following methodological considerations cf. also Bezuidenhout (1986), pp. 8–28; M.C.A. Korpel and J.C. de Moor, 'Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 1–61.

[22] See, e.g., J.C. de Moor, 'Syntax Peculiar to Ugaritic Poetry', in J.C. de Moor and W.G.E. Watson, *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT 42), Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, pp. 191–205; and part VI, 2.4 on the structuring function of anacrusis.

---

[23] In the past decades the overall design of Hebrew poetry has not been *systematically* investigated in a specific monograph, as far as I know; see for the Psalms STR, pp. 471–527. Cf. further M. Girard, *Les Psaumes. Analyse structurelle et interprétation. 1–50* (Recherches, nouvelle série 2), Montréal and Paris: Éditions Bellarmin and Éditions du Cerf, 1984 (note pp. 41–47); P.R. Raabe, *Psalm Structures. A Study of Psalms with Refrains* (JSOTS 104), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990; P. Auffret, *Voyez de vos yeux. Étude structurelle de vingt psaumes, dont le psaume 119* (SupplVT 48), Leiden: Brill, 1993. I can also point now to some dissertations which emerged within the 'Kampen School': W. van der Meer, *Oude Woorden Worden Nieuw. De opbouw van het boek Joël*, Kampen: Kok, 1989; W.T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTS 93), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990; J. Kim, *The Structure of the Samson Cycle*, Kampen: Kok, 1993. Note in this connection also J. Renkema, *Klaagliederen* (COT), Kampen: Kok, 1993. Cf. further, e.g., M. O'Connor, *op. cit.*, pp. 423–539; the investigations by J.P. Fokkelman in *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. A Full Interpretation Based on Stylistic and Structural Analyses*, 4 vols., Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981–93 (especially vol. 2, pp. 1–21, and vol. 4, pp. 73–111 [about the song of Hannah in 1 Sam. 2,1–10]); W.G.E. Watson (1984), pp. 160–200; R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry*, New York: Basic Books, 1985 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990); H. van Grol, *op. cit.*, pp. 197–239; D. Grossberg, *Centripetal and Centrifugal Structures in Biblical Poetry* (SBL Monograph Series 39), Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1989; Y. Gitay, *Isaiah and his Audience. The Structure and Meaning of Isaiah 1–12* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 30), Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1991; M. Butterworth, *Structure and the Book of Zechariah* (JSOTS 130), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

[24] Cf. Fokkelman, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 10.

[25] This approach meets the requirement that 'a fresh analysis must employ a method which in its operation makes observable what goes on in every phase of the analysis of the linguistic structures of the text'; Kim, *op. cit.*, p. 118 (note also pp. 120–21).

[26] See for this aspect of the methodology especially the final section on each poem: 'comments and summary' (analysis x.6). I also thought it wise to use the same form of presentation as I did in STR.

1.2 The logical grouping of the contents

To a certain degree it is surely justified when exegetes time and again stress that an investigation into the strophic structure of the poetry of the Hebrew Bible should never disregard the aspect of the development of the thought-content, the thematic flow of a specific composition. In the first stage of my inquiry, therefore, I present a description of the content of the poem in question: analysis x.2. This description corresponds to the rhetorical framework of the poem as this was established on the basis of the investigation as a whole.[27] Because each piece of poetry formally and thematically comprises several levels, this stratification has to be made clear in the description of the contents too. Roman numerals indicate the cantos of the poem. The strophes are marked by noting the masoretic verses that correspond to the strophe concerned at the end of the description of its content. If the cantos divide into canticles that encompass the strophes, the canticles are indicated by the Roman numeral of the canto, followed by Arabic numerals (e.g., I.1, I.2). Hence, this first line of approach already corresponds to the rhetorical framework of the poem as much as possible. I do not claim that my descriptions of the poem's contents do justice to all its nuances and richness of meaning. For my purpose it is of importance to stress the special meaning of the individual strophes, canticles and cantos, so as to support their demarcation from each other. If from a thematic point of view there is a smooth transition from one strophe to another ('enjambement'), this will generally be discussed in the final item of the analysis (x.6).

We have to take into account, however, that this description of the logical separation of the contents can only partially justify the divisions into cantos and strophes. This is not because I am a champion of the theory of strophic structure in Hebrew poetry. The regnant confusion among critics as to the build up of a piece of Hebrew poetry proves that, generally speaking, a thematic analysis can only partially elucidate its 'logical' framework. The analyses x.5 illustrate this point with regard to the individual poems in the book of Job. It appears to be impossible to reach a consensus regarding a piece of Hebrew poetry from the perspective of content only.

This state of affairs is, in my opinion, a result of the circumstance that too little attention has been paid to the *formal aspects* of Hebrew poetry as far as its macrostructure is concerned.[28] The confusion referred to above does not stem from a certain vagueness of the Hebrew poets as to the macrostructure of their compositions, but is a result of our poor knowledge as to the techniques which were at their disposal. An investigation into the formal aspects of the macrostructure of Hebrew poetry will help place conclusions on a more objective, controllable basis. This foundation, I think, can be laid by my analysis of the *transition markers* and the *verbal repetitions.*

---

[27] Hence, this description generally does not mirror the starting point of the investigation. Nevertheless, this thematic approach should never contradict the 'logical' development of the content. The 'logic' of this development, however, is often more complicated than modern critics are ready to accept. Therefore, as the following investigation will show, thematic analysis frequently depends on a formal approach to the structure of the poem; cf. Bezuidenhout (1986), p. 9–10.

1.3 Transition markers

On the level of the strophes I make use of formal markers that demarcate the beginning and the end of these units. This is a special group of words and grammatical forms, that mark the *turning points* within a Hebrew poem (cf. the Greek word *strophè*, which means 'turn'): analysis x.3.

I follow a hint of Köster's in exploring this formal aspect of Hebrew poetry to establish its strophic structure. More than 150 years ago this scholar already pointed out that exclamations, specific set phrases, and particles can be taken as 'Stichwörter' which introduce the transition to a new strophe.[29] Evidently, Köster was already reasoning in formal categories here, for he continues: 'Dabei darf es uns nun auch nicht irre machen, wenn einzelne Strophen sich durch Einheit des Inhalts nicht so scharf absondern, als andere. Pflegen ja doch alle Dichter, schon der gefälligen Abwechslung zu Liebe, nicht immer die Sinn-Pause mit dem Schlusse der Strophe zusammen fallen zu lassen'.[30] In my review of the history of strophic investigation I showed, however, that this understanding has not received due attention.[31] In recent times, Muilenburg deserves credit for having focused on this phenomenon of 'transition markers'.[32] Muilenburg himself made use of these words in his own analyses of Hebrew poetry. For him particles play an important part in Hebrew poetry as a whole. In the first place the demonstrative and emphatic particle *ky*, which for the most part has a causal sense, and therefore occurs in strategic positions at the beginning and the end of strophes. The same applies to the particle *hn/hnh* ('behold'). This particle 'appears in striking contexts, either by introducing a poem or strophe or by bringing it to its culmination'. Muilenburg points as well to the particles *lkn* ('therefore'), *lmh* ('why') and *w'th* ('and now'). In addition, the vocative use of the name of God and all kinds of rhetorical questions serve to mark the framework and the structure of the strophes.

---

[28] This criticism also applies to the approach by Bezuidenhout. According to this approach the structure of the poems in the book of Job reveals itself by an analysis of the systematic alternation of motifs; see Bezuidenhout (1986), pp. 22–27.

[29] Köster, 'Die Strophen' (1831), p. 54.

[30] Köster, 'Die Strophen' (1831), p. 54

[31] Cf. STR, pp. 213–14.

[32] J. Muilenburg, 'Form Criticism and Beyond', *JBL* 88 (1969), pp. 1–18 (especially pp. 13–16); now in P.R. House (ed.), *Beyond Form Criticism. Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 2), Winona Lake (Indiana): Eisenbrauns, 1992, pp. 49–69.

As my investigation into the strophic structure of the Psalms shows, this is an area of research which is almost unexplored but which yields important stylistic findings that further our understanding of the techniques the Hebrew poets employed.[33] This is also true for the book of Job. As I noted in part I, according to Köster, in the book of Job only the particle *hn* ('behold') functions as a transition marker. Hontheim took into consideration still other words; e.g., *w'th* ('and now'), *hn 'l* ('behold, God'), the particle *'k* ('certainly'). Furthermore he points to the use of divine names and the tricolon.[34]

In this context I wish to call attention to a problem posed especially by the most common type of strophe in Hebrew poetry, the two-line strophe.[35] In the book of Job we meet with 234 two-line strophes, whereas 163 three-line strophes occur. According to Muilenburg 'formal devices' sometimes demarcate the beginning, sometimes the end of a strophe. If this is so, the demarcating force of the 'formal devices' in the two-line strophes would be very insignificant, to put it mildly. In these instances the device would always turn up in the first or the last line. Thus, each time the outcome would be positive, but in fact nothing would be proved.[36] Fortunately, a systematic investigation of the transition markers reveals that Muilenburg's opinion needs some correction. In particular, some of these markers generally—though not exclusively—turn up at the beginning of a strophe, while others ordinarily—again not exclusively—occur at the end of a strophe. A significant illustration of this point is provided by the marker *'wlm* ('on the other hand'); see part VI, 3.1. In the book of Job this marker occurs eight times; 6× at the *beginning* of a strophe! In 14,8 we meet with *'wlm* in the second line of a three-line strophe. This is obviously a contrary indication. Finally, in 17,10 this marker occurs in the *last* line of a *canticle*. In this case, I think, we are not dealing with a contrary indication, but with a *secondary* function of *'wlm* to demarcate the end of a *higher* poetic unit. An example of the opposite case is provided by the particle *gm* ('also'); see part VI, 3.2. In the book of Job we meet this particle nineteen times; 10× at the *end* of a strophe! In five instances we are dealing with a contrary indication because the particle turns up in the first line of a two-line strophe or in the second line of a three-line strophe. Finally, there remain four instances where I reckon with a *secondary* function of the particle *gm.* In 16,19 and 24,19 the particle occurs at the *beginning* of a *canticle*, in 18,5 at the *beginning* of a new *canto*, and in 41,1 in the first line of a 3-line strophe. In the last instance (41,1) the demarcating value of *gm* is not very impressive, but for the sake of completeness and consistency in this case too I reckon with a secondary function.

---

[33] See especially STR, pp. 508–24.

[34] See part I, 3.3 above.

[35] So also Kraft and Wahl; see note 9 above.

[36] This criticism also applies to the application of the transition markers by the 'Kampen School'; see, e.g., Koopmans, *op. cit.*, pp. 180–225.

Thus, in analysis x.3.1 I list the transition markers that occur in the first lines of the strophes; as the case may be this first line may coincide with the beginning of a new canticle or canto, or with the beginning of the poem as a whole. There are separate entries for the markers that generally denote the beginning of a strophe (analysis x.3.1.1) and for the markers that generally denote the end of a strophe, but now occur in the first line of a 3-line strophe or a higher poetic unit (analysis x.3.1.2).

In analysis x.3.2 I list the transition markers that occur in the last line of the strophes; as the case may be this last line may coincide with the end of a canticle, a canto, or with the end of the poem as a whole. Again there are separate entries for the markers that generally denote the end of a strophe (analysis x.3.2.1) and for the markers that generally denote the beginning of a strophe, but occur in the last line of a 3-line strophe or a higher poetic unit (analysis x.3.2.2).

I assume that a fairly great number of words can function as transition markers. However, this does not suggest arbitrariness or carelessness in the choice of these markers. It is possible to group them into a limited number of grammatical categories. I distinguish seven different categories of markers which primarily denote the beginning of a strophe:

(a) imperatives and other verb forms with an imperative meaning like cohortatives and jussives;

(b) vocatives;

(c) paronomastic infinitive constructions;

(d) interrogative particles like *‘d ’n(h)*, *h-*, *lmh*, *mdw‘*, *mh*, and the interrogative pronoun (*my*);

(e) ‘emphatic’ particles: *’wlm*, *’z*, *’k*/*’kn*, *’mnm*, *’pw(’)*, *hn*/*hnh*, *lkn*, *n’*, *‘th*, and *w-* at the beginning of a line;

(f) demonstrative pronouns and personal pronouns: *’lh*, *’ny*, *’th*, *hw’*, *zwt*;

(g) a specific noun (*’nwš*, *ḥnp*) or verb (*ḥrš*).

It should be noted that there is some kind of distinction between these categories. The first three categories (the imperatives, vocatives and paronomastic inf. constructions) represent a syntactical function, and the following categories represent primarily a lexical dimension. The interrogative particles and pronouns (d) should be taken as representatives of a category in between: interrogative sentences.

The transition markers that primarily demarcate the end of a strophe may also be grouped into a limited number of categories. Here I distinguish four different categories:

(a) particles: *’l* (prohib.), *’p*, *gm*, *zh*, *lm‘n*;[37]
(b) personal pronouns: *’nky*, *hy’*, *hm/hmh*;
(c) words that point to a very long time, ‘eternity’: *lnṣḥ*, *‘d*, *‘wlm*;[38]
(d) a specific verb (*’mr*) or noun (*rš‘*, *tqwh*).

The exploration of the transition markers in an individual poem each time ends with an entry in which I list the words and grammatical forms that must be taken as *contrary indications* in the context of the methodology described above: analysis x.3.3.

Naturally, I do not exclude the possibility that further investigation will reveal more words and other categories of words and grammatical forms that can be taken as transition markers. As far as I could discover, however, casus pendens and anaphora (the identical beginning of two successive lines) are not qualified for this function. Systematic investigation into the demarcating value of these stylistic forms did not produce significant results. Each time we surmise a new transition marker, the given word or grammatical construction should be investigated as such in a fairly large number of poetic lines. In this context I refer the reader, who is studying the transition markers which I use in analyses x.3, to the overviews I have drawn up in part VI, 3. These systematic overviews of a given word provide information, as far as the book of Job is concerned, on the number of times the Hebrew poets used or did not use that particular word as a transition marker. The information in that section is presented in such a way that the reader can decide for himself how great the demarcating force is of any given transition marker I employ in establishing the strophic structure of the speeches in the book of Job.

---

[37] An observant reader will not fail to notice that I do not take as a transition marker the particle *ky*, which is mentioned as such by Muilenburg. See also J. Muilenburg, ‘The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle *ky* in the Old Testament’, *HUCA* 32 (1961), pp. 135–60; É. Beaucamp, ‘Structure strophique des Psaumes’, *RSR* 56 (1968), pp. 206–07 and A. Schoors, ‘The Particle *kī*’, in A.S. van der Woude, *Remembering all the Way* … (OTS 21), Leiden: Brill, 1981, pp. 240–76. The same is true for the particle *’m*, which in the Psalms I staged as a marker of the end of a strophe. I did not include these words because it is impossible for me to determine whether these particles primarily mark the beginning or the end of a strophe in the book of Job. As far as the particle *’m* is concerned the outcome in the Psalms was not convincing either; see STR, p. 520. In the book of Job we come across the particle *’m* 103×; the particle occurs 35× at the end of a strophe, 30× at the beginning of a three-line strophe or a higher poetic unit, 20× in external parallelism with *’m* at the beginning or at the end of a strophe. From this perspective, the particle must 18× be seen as a contrary indication with respect to the strophic structure concerned.

[38] See B. Herrnstein Smith, *Poetic Closure. A Study of How Poems End*, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 182–86 (on ‘unqualified assertion’) and E. Häublein, *The Stanza* (The Critical Idiom Series), New York: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1978, p. 68. Herrnstein Smith points out that such words tend to have closural effects when they occur as terminal features in a poem. ‘They imply that a point has been reached beyond which nothing further can or will be said’ (p. 183). According to Häublein there are definitely more stanzas than poems concluded in this way.

1.4 Verbal repetitions

One of the most important formal features that frame the macrostructure of a Hebrew poem, I think, are the patterns of verbal repetitions, which can be observed in every poem: analysis x.4. These patterns generally appear to play a major part in determining the main units of the poems, the division into cantos and strophes, and—as the case may be—the canticles. We are dealing here with some sort of repetitive, verbal parallelism that goes beyond the parallelism between the successive cola of a Hebrew line, the *parallelismus membrorum* or the *internal* parallelism.[39] To denote parallelism that characterizes these higher poetic levels I use the term '*external* parallelism', or '*distant* parallelism'.[40] With regard to some chapters, several commentators of the book of Job already had a notion of this phenomenon. Thus, with regard to ch. 3 it was recorded that the repetition of the interrogative particle *lmh* ('why?') at the very beginning of vv. 11 and 20 introduces new main units in the poem. The same phenomenon was recorded in ch. 30 in connection with the repetition of the expression *w'th* ('but now') at the very beginning of vv. 1, 9, and 16. In these chapters we are obviously dealing with a formal device which marks the overall structure of the compositions. However, it was not noted that the repetition of the noun *'nwš* ('human being') in 7,1 and 17 also marks the beginning of a main unit; nor that the repetition of the expression *w'ynny* ('and I will be no more') in the same chapter at the very end of vv. 8 and 21 is an indication of the end of the same, main units (cf., however, recently Habel and Bezuidenhout).

---

[39] On repetitive parallelism see now E. Zurro, *Procedimientos iterativos en la poesía ugarítica y hebrea* (Biblica et Orientalia 43), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1987; cf. also D. Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism. A Trial Cut* (*'nt* I and Proverbs 2) (SupplVT 39), Leiden and New York: Brill, 1988, pp. 169–70 and 193–94. Watson uses the term 'internal' parallelism to denote parallel phenomena within the *colon*; see W.G.E. Watson, 'Internal Parallelism in Ugaritic Verse', *Studi epigrafici e linguistici* 1 (1984), pp. 53–67; —, 'Internal Parallelism in Ugaritic Verse: Further Examples', *UF* 17 (1985), pp. 345–56; —, 'Internal Parallelism in Classical Hebrew Verse', *Biblica* 66 (1985), pp. 365–84; —, 'Internal or half-line parallelism in Classical Hebrew Poetry', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 44–66.

[40] For the designation 'distant parallelism' see M. Dahood, in L.R. Fisher (ed.), 'Ras Shamra Parallels', vol. 1 (Analecta Orientalia 49), Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1972, pp. 80–81. Recently, Pardee has correctly called attention to this aspect of parallelism to define the macrostructure of Hebrew (and Ugaritic) poetry; see D. Pardee, *op. cit.*, pp. 187–91.

Interpreting the repetition of *'nwš* in 7,1 and 17 as a formal device, is not to say that the marking value is as obvious and the argument as persuasive as in cases where the repetitions occur at the very beginning or the very end of main units. However, this phenomenon of *external*, or distant parallelism is generally not restricted to just one word! We are generally dealing with a small group, a cluster of words that determines a given poetic unit in its relationship to another poetic unit. Thus, in ch. 3 *lmh* ('why?') is not the only word that marks the beginning of the second and the third cantos. This word is only part of a much broader phenomenon that characterizes the beginning of these cantos; see also the repetitions of the roots *mwt* ('to die') and *ṭmn* ('to hide') and of the noun *'wr* ('light') in the first strophes of the cantos mentioned (see section 2 below). This phenomenon, then, can be matched with the refrain. In the book of Job the refrain in its well-known manifestation only occurs in ch. 28 (vv. 12 and 20). It is further interesting to note that we meet here a refrain which is not exactly identical; cf. *tmṣ'* (v. 12) and *tbw'* (v. 20). This is typical of refrains in Hebrew poetry.[41] Thus, the final refrain of ch. 28 does not retain more than two words of the original; see *ḥkmh* ('wisdom') and *bynh* ('understanding'). Hence, external repetitive parallelism can be interpreted as a refrain-like device which the Hebrew poets utilized to shape their compositions.[42]

For the most part these patterns of verbal repetition are not restricted to the beginning and the end of the units of which the poem is built up. In general these patterns control the units in their entirety. That is to say, e.g., that as far as verbal repetition is concerned the first strophe of canto I corresponds to the first strophe of canto II, and the second strophe of canto I corresponds to the second strophe of canto II, etc.

To determine these patterns of verbal repetition it is in the first place necessary to compile a list of all the verbal repetitions that occur in a given poem, in other words, to produce a concordance of each individual poem: analysis x.4.1 ('General outline'). Starting from this concordance it is possible to univocally and reliably establish the patterns that control the structure of a given poem.[43] Analysis x.4.2, then, records the verbal repetitions that occur within the individual strophes of a poem. If there is a structural level of canticles between the strophes and the cantos, analysis x.4.3 systematically records the repetitions that form the individual canticles. These repetitions also provide information on the strophic framework of the composition. Analysis x.4.4, in this case, records the repetitions that form the cantos. These repetitions, then, also provide information on the framework of the canticles. Otherwise—when there is no level of canticles—analysis x.4.3 records the repetitions that form the cantos of the poem. These repetitions, then, also provide information on the framework of the strophes. Finally, the repetitions that frame the poem as a whole are systematically listed in analysis x.4.4 (or as the case may be, analysis x.4.5).[44] These repetitions also provide information on the framework of the cantos. When in the analyses x.4.2–5 in a given context all the verbal repetitions are listed, the item is concluded with an exclamation mark; see, e.g., *rwḥ* in section 3.4.5 below.

---

[41] Cf. P.R. Raabe, *Psalm Structures. A Study of Psalms with Refrains* (JSOTS 104), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

[42] Cf. Watson (1984), p. 297.

When a poem opens or ends with a canto which, as far as canto-length is concerned, does not harmonize with the cantos of the main body of the poem, this canto generally follows the same pattern of repetitive parallelism that controls the main units; see, e.g., ch. 8 (anal. 7.4.4).

The analysis of the externally parallelistic phenomena is sometimes more complicated than could be pointed out above. D.H. Müller already noted that apart from the linear patterns, which he termed 'responsions', we have to consider the phenomena of 'concatenatio' and 'inclusio' as well (see part I, 3.2). That is to say, verbal repetition in two successive lines does not automatically combine these lines into a strophe; see *bṭn* ('womb') in 3,10 and 11, *sws* ('horse') in 39,18 and 19—concatenatio. And distant parallelism does not automatically point to refrain-like features; see *byn* ('to understand') in 6,24 and 30—inclusio. Sometimes no specific phenomena of responsio, inclusio, or concatenatio can be identified in the case of repetition of a given word in a canto, canticle, or strophe. If the word does not occur anywhere else in the poem, then, it is nevertheless possible to take that word as evidence of the individual character of the unit involved; see, e.g., *pnym* in section 3.4.4 below (of course, in this case too, the item is concluded with an exclamation mark).

---

[43] Butterworth rightly criticizes the arbitrariness of scholars who trifle with the verbal repetitions to support their structural interpretations of Hebrew poetry; see M. Butterworth, *Structure and the Book of Zechariah* (JSOTS 130), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992, pp. 30–52 (note also p. 60). Cf. also Kim, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[44] Thus, the word 'strophic' in the headings of analyses x.4 must not be taken in its narrow sense, but is also used for the higher structural levels of the poems.

It may be clear, that the analysis of verbal repetitions as a tool to define the structure of a Hebrew poem is not an invention of my own or a recent approach. It was again Köster, who already investigated the 'Parallelismus der Verse' (1831). And more than fifty years later this aspect of Hebrew poetry became a special object of study by D.H. Müller and his school; note especially the device which was designated by Müller as 'Wortresponsion'. However, as noted above, with regard to the poetry of the book of Job this phenomenon has not been explored at all up till now!; see section 1.1 above (formal devices).

In connection with the verbal repetitions I also record alliterations and word pairs, or parallel pairs, now and then; see, e.g., the alliteration *tl'h* ... *thlh* in section 3.4.5 below, and the word pair *'bd* ('to perish') // *mwt* ('to die') in section 3.4.2 below. These phenomena, however, can only play a supporting part in determining the macrostructure of a poem. I would like to underline in this connection that the analysis should focus on the exploration of repetitive, verbal parallelism (verbatim repetitions) which occurs in a given poem.[45]

1.5 Different divisions

Under analysis x.5 the reader will find a formalized list which provides a review of text divisions that have been adopted by other scholars in the more or less recent past. The author's name followed by a year in parentheses refers to a publication that can be found in the bibliography. If the publication is not a commentary on the book of Job or another study, in which the chapters of this book are consecutively dealt with, generally a reference to one or more pages from that publication follow. Then, by using the masoretic verses, I present the divisions which the critic concerned detects in the poem in question. When the divisions cut through a masoretic verse, the characters that follow the number of the verse represent its successive cola (e.g., 1a = first colon of verse 1; 3b = second colon of verse 3, etc.; see for the colometric divisions the layout of the text at the beginning of each new section). The dots between the masoretic verses or groups of verses represent the turning points between the strophes. When in addition to that a critic distinguishes strophes from higher poetic units (stanzas or cantos) a vertical line (|) marks the disjunction between these higher units. When the critic assumes a transition from one poem to another within a coherent textcorpus I use a semicolon.

---

[45] Cf. D. Pardee, *op. cit.*, pp. 200–01.

This overview does not only refer to scholars who support a strophic interpretation of the poetry of the book of Job in the strict sense of the word. I deemed it correct and useful to incorporate here also the divisions that did not emerge on the basis of a specific strophic theory. However, when the division referred to also reflects a strophic interpretation, I record in parentheses the strophic scheme that corresponds to that division whenever possible. In that case the figures represent the number of the lines or cola that form the strophes, cantos or canticles. This depends on the strophic theory advocated by the critic concerned. The theories that form the bases of these interpretations are described in part I of this study.

The significance of the data brought together under this item is threefold:

(a) In the historical survey presented in the foregoing part I exemplified the descriptions of the strophic theories by just a few specimens. In analysis x.5 I mention almost all the divisions of the critics that were dealt with in part I. Thus, this analysis can be taken as a necessary complement to the historical survey.

(b) The multitude of opinions which is generally ventilated on the macrostructure of the individual poems illustrates once more the need for systematic investigation into this aspect of Hebrew poetry in genenal (cf. section 1.1 above).[46]

(c) The overview of analysis x.5 enables the reader to ascertain instantaneously to which extent my divisions correspond to or deviate from previous results of structural investigation. When there is a certain measure of consensus with a particular critic his name is printed in italics. When my structural analysis obviously deviates from a *current* opinion, special attention will be paid to this fact in the final item of each individual poem (see analysis x.6).

1.6 Comments and summary

The preceding four stages of analysis essentially determine the rhetorical framework I assume for the individual poems. Nevertheless, the analyses are in each case concluded by a section that provides an opportunity for supplementary remarks, 'comments and summary' (analysis x.6). These remarks may elucidate a few data that in the analyses x.1–5 have been described adequately indeed, but yet rather schematically and abstractly (see about analysis x.1 section 1.7 below). I will indicate which of these data are especially important for the understanding of the macrostructure of the poem. I will also set out how the different stages of the analysis should be integrated to reach the most plausible, rhetorical framework in a given case.

---

[46] The confusion of tongues recorded should, of course, not give way to feelings of despair as if it would be impossible to ever reach some unanimity regarding the rhetorical structure of Hebrew poetry; nor is it my intention to exemplify the view that analysis of the macrostructure of a Hebrew poem is not of great importance for its interpretation.

In this section I further create room for discussion with critics whose divisions deserve more attention than could be given in analysis x.5. If possible and necessary I will point out the distinctive features of my own approach with respect to previous results. But what is more, on the basis of my rhetorical analyses I will attempt for each poem to define its *leading idea*, its *quintessential thought*,[47]) and the relationship of this leading idea to the theology of the book of Job as a whole (cf. Bezuidenhout [1986], pp. 27–28).

1.7 The reproduction of the texts

For a clear understanding of the macrostructure and the colometric divisions advocated by me, the transliterated text of each individual poem precedes the analyses.[48] The layout of these texts serves to clarify the structure of the poems as much as possible and advisable. The poetic lines of the strophes I note down on one and the same physical line. A written horizontal line marks the disjunction between the cantos of the poems. These cantos are indicated by uppercase Roman numerals. The strophes are demarcated from each other by spacing between the lines. When a canto falls into canticles I mark these units by Arabic numerals which follow the Roman numeral of the canto (e.g., I.1; I.2). When the poem opens with an introductory line, strophe or canto this unit is marked by a capital 'A'; when the poem ends with a concluding line, strophe or canto this unit is marked by a capital 'B'.

The layout of the texts also shows the most important verbal repetitions that—among other phenomena—determine the macrostructure of a given poem. The verbal repetitions that play a part on the level of the relationship between the cantos are printed in capitals. Those repetitions that play a part on the level of the framework of the cantos themselves are printed in bold face. The repetitions that play a part within the framework of the canticles are printed in small caps. Mostly, only responsions (*linear* verbal repetitions) are marked off by this means, and no inclusions or concatenations. Sometimes part of a responsio on a lower structural level (within a canticle or strophe) also functions on a higher level (a canto or the poem as a whole) as an obvious responsio. In these cases the word in question is printed with the characters belonging to the higher level of responsions (whereas the other part of the responsio merely displays the characters belonging to the lower level); see, e.g., the root *'bd* in Job 4,7.9.11.20 (note *'bd* in v. 11).

---

[47] Cf. the 'nodal verse' of Clines; see D.J.A. Clines, 'The Arguments of Job's Three Friends', in D.J.A. Clines a.o. (eds.), *Art and Meaning* (JSOTS 19), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982, pp. 200–01.

[48] I realize that it might have been welcome—not only to the less trained readers of Hebrew—if I had provided a translation of the texts as well. Such a translation, however, would be quite a job, complicated as it would be by the requirement of concordant rendering. Moreover, that translation would have claimed a relatively large space in this study.

To simplify the perception of the macrostructure of the poems a short schematic description of that structure precedes the layout of the texts. In this description the canto structure of the poems is laid down with the help of figures that represent the numbers of the lines of the cantos. These codes are followed by a code in which the figures represent the length of the strophes. As the case may be there is a stage in between, that lays down the canticle structure of the poem concerned; cf. the similar codes that, if applicable, follow the divisions recorded in analysis x.5.[49]

The versification employed throughout is exclusively that of the masoretic text, sometimes at variance with English translations.

The first stage of the analyses records major decisions of a textcritical, lexicographical or grammatical nature. There are no references in the texts themselves to these remarks. The characters that follow the verse-numbers in analysis x.1 refer to the respective cola of the masoretic verses. Generally, I will only allow myself to interfere with the masoretic text if the worst comes to the worst. The character of the investigation in some cases also allows me to refrain from indisputable decisions. Special attention will be paid to those questions which are elucidated by the investigation of the rhetorical structure of the poem involved.

See for the theory supporting the division of the speeches into four cycles—two rounds between the three friends and Job, a round between Job and God, and the Elihu-speeches (parts II–IV resp.)—the final part of this study, part VII.

---

[49] It is not by chance that the sequence of these codes differs from that used in STR. There the codes of the strophes come first. The change of this sequence reflects my conviction that the investigation has to focus in the first place on the highest levels of rhetorical structure and from that point onwards has to descend to the lower levels of this framework.

2 Job’s opening curse: Job 3

Structure: 8.9.7 > 1.3.3.1|3.3.3|4.3

I	3	*y’bd ywm ’wld* **bw**	*whlylh ’mr hrh GBR*	
	4	*hywm hhw’* **yhy** *ḥšk*	*’l ydršhw ’LWH mm‘l*	*w’l twp‘ ‘lyw nhrh*
	5	*yg’lhw ḥšk wṣlmwt*	*tškn ‘lyw ‘nnh*	*yb‘thw kmryry ywm*
	6	*hlylh hhw’ yqḥhw ’pl*	*’l yḥd bymy šnh*	*bmspr yrḥym ’l yb’*
	7	*hnh hlylh hhw’* **yhy** *glmwd*	*’l tb’ rnnh* **bw**	
	8	*yqbhw ’rry ywm*	*h‘tydym ‘rr lwytn*	
	9	*yḥškw kwkby nšpw*	*yqw l’WR W’YN*	*w’l yr’h b‘p‘py šḥr*
	10	*ky l’ sgr dlty BṬNy*	*wYSTR ‘ML m‘yny*	

II	11	*LMH l’ mrḥm ’MWT*	*mBṬN yṣ’ty w’gw‘*
	12	*mdw‘ qdmwny brkym*	*wmh šdym ky ’ynq*
	16	**’w** *knpl ṬMWN l’ ’hyh*	*k‘llym l’ r’w ’WR*
	13	*KY ‘th škbty w’ŠQWṬ*	*yšnty ’z YNWḤ ly*
	14	*‘m mlkym wy‘ṣy ’rṣ*	*hbnym ḥrbwt lmw*
	15	**’w** *‘m śrym zhb lhm*	*hmml’ym btyhm ksp*
	17	*šm rš‘ym ḥdlw RGZ*	*wšm YNWḤW ygy‘y kḥ*
	18	*yḥd ’syrym š’nnw*	*l’ šm‘w qwl ngś*
	19	*qṭn wgdwl šm hw’*	*w‘bd ḥpšy m’dnyw*

III	20	*LMH ytn l‘ML ’WR*	*wḥyym lmry npš*
	21	*hmḥkym lMWT W’YNnw*	*wyḥprhw mMṬMWNYM*
	22	*hśmḥym ’ly gyl*	*yśyśw ky ymṣ’w qbr*
	23	*lGBR ’šr drkw NSTRH*	*wysk ’LWH b‘dw*
	24	*KY lpny lḥmy ’nḥty tb’*	*wytkw kmym š’gty*
	25	*KY pḥd pḥdty wy’tyny*	*w’šr ygrty yb’ ly*
	26	*l’ šlwty wl’ ŠQṬTY*	*wl’ NḤTY wyb’ RGZ*

2.1 Text

V. 5c—*kmryry ywm*: ‘like the bitternesses of the day’; so MT. Most commentators suppose here a root *kmr* (‘be black’; so also HAL: **kmryr* = ‘Verfinsterung') and read 'blacknesses of the day' (= 'eclipses'). Michel proposes the translation 'Poisonous Ones of Sea' (cf. Deut. 32,24); see also Gordis.

V. 6b—*'l yḥd*: 'let it not rejoice' (jussive qal of *ḥdh* I); so MT and cf. v. 7b (Gordis). In connection with *'l yb'* in v. 6c it seems more likely that we must revocalize to 'let it not unite with' (jussive qal of *yḥd*; cf. Gen. 49,6). Dahood takes the verb as a jussive niph'al of *ḥdh* II ('let it not be seen'); see Blommerde (p. 38), and HAL (?). Gordis argues that we are dealing with an instance of *talḥin* (*double entendre*); cf. also G. Rendsburg, *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 48–51.

V. 8a—*ywm*: 'day'; so MT (and 'most commentators'; Michel). Although the emendation to *ym* ('sea') is attractive in view of the parallelism with *lwytn* in v. 8b 'it is impossible to see how partisans of order could be invoked to lay spells on the night' (Clines). Cf. also E. Ullendorf, *VT* 11 (1961), pp. 350–51.

V. 16: in spite of the structural analysis by Freedman (1968, note pp. 504–05; cf. Webster, Habel and Clines), I think it impossible to retain v. 16 in the place where it is in MT. In my opinion, Löhr, Dhorme, NEB and De Wilde are right in transposing v. 16 to follow vv. 11–12. *l' 'hyh* in v. 16a is governed by *lmh/mdw'* in vv. 11–12 (Duhm, Irwin, Skehan, Epping-Nelis and NAB read the line after v. 11). *šm* in v. 17a–b ties on to vv. 13–15, from which it is separated in MT (Fohrer deletes v. 16). Finally, this transposition is strongly supported by anal. 2.4.4 (see below).

2.2 Content

Job's opening lament: his wish to be dead.

I Job curses the day of his birth.
    Let the day and the night of my origin perish (v. 3).
    That day (and that night)—would it had perished in darkness (vv. 4–6).
    That night—would it had remained infertile by incantations (vv. 7–9).
    Because my dreadful existence began that moment (v. 10).

II Job wishes that he was in the realm of death.
    Why did not my life end immediately after my birth? (vv. 11–12+16);
    then, I would be with distinguished people in the grave now (vv. 13–15).
    There, it is a good place for the less fortunate men on earth (vv. 17–19).

III Job complains about a painful life, that drags on without sense.
    Why does He prolong the life of a man who has to suffer? (vv. 20–23; about mankind in general).

Look at my existence full of suffering (vv. 24–26; about Job in particular).

2.3 Transition markers

2.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

2.3.1.1 jussive: *y'bd*, v. 3a
hw', v. 4a
jussive: *yhy*, v. 4a
hnh, v. 7a
hw', v. 7a
jussive: *yhy*, v. 7a
lmh, v. 11a; ext. // *mdw'* in v. 12a and *mh* in v. 12b
‘th, v. 13a
'z, v. 13b
lmh, v. 20a

2.3.1.2 *'mr*, v. 3b
'l (prohib.), v. 4b+c
'l (prohib.), v. 7b
rš‘, v. 17a

2.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

2.3.2.1 *'l* (prohib.), v. 6b+c
'l (prohib.), v. 9c

2.3.2.2 *hw'*, v. 6a
jussive: *yqw* in v. 9b
hw', v. 19a

2.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

no remarks

2.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

2.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

': *'w*, vv. 15, 16; *'wr*, vv. 9, 16, 20; *'yn*, vv. 9, 21; *'l* (prohib.), vv. 4, 4, 6, 6, 7, 9; *'lwh*, vv. 4, 23; *'šr*, vv. 23, 25
b: *b-*, vv. 3, 6, 6, 7, 9; *bw'*, vv. 6, 7, 24, 25, 26; *bṭn*, vv. 10, 11
g: *gbr*, vv. 3, 23
h: *h-* (article), vv. 3, 4, 4, 6, 6, 7, 7, 8, 15, 21, 22; *-hw*, vv. 4, 5, 5, 6, 8, 21; *hw'*, vv. 4, 6, 7, 19; *hyh*, vv. 4, 7, 16; *-hm*, vv. 15, 15
w: *-w*, vv. 3, 4, 5, 7, 19, 23, 23
ḥ: *ḥšk*, vv. 4, 5, 9
ṭ: *ṭmn*, vv. 16, 21
y: *-y*, vv. 10, 10, 13, 24 (3×), 25; *ywm*, vv. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
k: *k-*, vv. 16, 16, 24; *ky*, vv. 10, 12, 13, 22, 24, 25
l: *l-*, vv. 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 20 (3×), 21, 23, 24, 25; *l'*, vv. 10, 11, 16, 16, 18, 26 (3×); *lylh*, vv. 3, 6, 7

m: *mh*, vv. 11, 20; *mwt*, vv. 11, 21; *mn*, vv. 4, 10, 11, 11, 19, 21
n: *nwḥ*, vv. 13, 17, 26; *-ny*, vv. 12, 25
s: *str*, vv. 10, 23
‘: *‘l*, vv. 4, 5; *‘m*, vv. 14, 15; *‘ml*, vv. 10, 20
p: *pḥd*, vv. 25, 25
r: *r’h*, vv. 9, 16; *rgz*, vv. 17, 26
š: *šm*, vv. 17, 17, 19; *šqṭ*, vv. 13, 26

2.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 4–6:	*hywm hhw’/hlylh hhw’*, vv. 4a and 6a resp.—inclusio; see also *ywm* in vv. 5c and 6b
	ḥšk, vv. 4a.5a
	’l (prohib.), vv. 4b+c.6b+c—inclusio
	‘lyw, vv. 4c.5b!; see also *m‘l* in v. 4b
	yg’lhw/yqḥhw, vv. 5a and 6a resp.—alliter.
	ṣlmwt/’pl, vv. 5a and 6a resp.—linear
vv. 7–9:	*’l* (prohib), vv. 7b.9c—inclusio
	b-, vv. 7b.9c—inclusio
vv. 11–12+16:	*l* and *m* sound, vv. 11.12.16
	mh, vv. 11a and 12b; see also *mdw’* in v.12a
	l’, vv. 11a.16a+b—inclusio
vv. 13–15:	*l-*, vv. 13b.14b.15a; note *lmw*, *lhm* . . . *-hm* in vv. 14b and 15 resp.!
	‘m, vv. 14a.15a!
vv. 17–19:	*šm*, vv. 17a+b.19a!—inclusio (Skehan)
	rš‘ym/šm‘w, vv. 17a and 18b resp.—alliteration
vv. 20–23:	*l* and *m* sound, vv. 20 and 21
	h- (article), vv. 21a.22a—anaphora
	ṭmn/str, vv. 21b and 23a resp.
	qbr/gbr, vv. 22b and 23a resp.—alliteration
vv. 24–26:	*ky*, vv. 24a.25a—exactly linear
	l- + *-y*, vv. 24a.25b
	bw’, vv. 24a.25b.26b (cf. Alter, p. 83)

2.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 3–10 (canto I):	*ywm*, vv. 3a.4a+5c+6b.8a!
	b-, vv. 3a.6b+c.7b+9c!
	bw, vv. 3a.7b!
	yhy, vv. 4a.7a!—linear
	ḥšk, vv. 4a+5a.9a!—symmetric

'l (prohib.), vv. 4b+c+6b+c.7b+9c!—symmetric/concat.; note *w'l* in vv. 4c and 9c! (symmetric!)
mn, vv. 4b.10b—linear
nhrh/rnnh, vv. 4c and 7b resp. (alliter.)—linear
yb'thw kmryry ywm/yqbhw 'rry ywm, vv. 5c and 8a resp. (alliter.)—symmetric
hlylh hhw', vv. 6a and 7a!—concatenatio; see also *hlylh* in v. 3b!, and *hhw'* in v. 4a!
bw', vv. 6c.7b—concatenatio; note *'l yb'* and *'l tb'* resp.

vv. 11–19 (canto II): *l'*, vv. 11a+16a+b.18b
mn, vv. 11a+b.19b—inclusio
'ẁ, vv. 16a.15a!—exactly linear
nwḥ, vv. 13b.17b—linear

vv. 20–26 (canto III): *'šr*, vv. 23a and 25b!

2.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 3–10.11–12+16.20–23: *gbr*, vv. 3b.23a!
hyh, vv. 4a+7a.16a!
'lwh, vv. 4b.23b!
mn, vv. 4b+10b.11a+b.21b
kmryry/mry, vv. 5c and 20b resp.—alliter.
nšp/npš, vv. 9a and 20b resp.—alliter.
'wr, vv. 9b.16b.20a!
w'yn, vv. 9b.21a!
r'h, vv. 9c.16b!
bṭn, vv. 10a.11b! (concatenatio)
str, vv. 10b.23a!; see also *ṭmn* in vv. 16a and 21b!
'ml, vv. 10b.20a!
lmh, vv. 11a.20a!—exactly linear
l and *m* sound, vv. 11–12+16.20–21 (linear)
mwt, vv. 11a.21a!—linear
ṭmn, vv. 16a.21b!

vv. 13–19.24–26: *ky* beginning line, vv. 13.24–25; see also v. 10a!
šqt, vv. 13a.26a!
rgz, vv. 17a.26b!—linear } chiasm; see also
nwḥ, vv. 17b.26b—linear
nwḥ in v. 13b!

vv. 17–19.20–23, concat.: *mn*, vv. 19b.21b

2.4.5 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

2.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration
h- (article), *hw'* (v. 19), *-w*, *-y*, *ky*, *l-*, *l'*

2.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration
-hw, *k-*, (*pḥd*)

2.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831), pp. 76–79: 3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10|11–12.13–15.16.17–19|20–22.23.24–26 (1.2.2.2.1|2.3.1.3|3.1.3)
Köster (1831): 3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10|11–13.14–16.17–19|20–22.23–26 (1.2.2.2.1|3.3.3|3.3); cf. Schlottmann (1851)
Stickel (1842): 3–5.6–9.10–12.13–16.17–19.20–23.24–26 (3.4.3.4.3.4.3); similarly Kissane (1939)
Ewald (1854): 3–10.11–19.20–26; similarly Hitzig (1874), Ball (1922), König (1929), Horst (1968), RSV (1952)
Dillmann (1869): 3–10.11–19.20–26 ('Die 3 Wendungen treten klar hervor, und sind die 2 letzten sogar durch das gleiche Anfangswort (*lmh*) gekennzeichnet ... Ganz gleichmässig sind die Strophen nicht'; 3–5.6–10|11–13.14–16.17–19|20–22.23–26)
Merx (1871): 3|4–5.6–8a.8b–10|11–12.13–14.15–16|17–19.20–22.24–25+23|26 (2|3×6|3×4|3×6|2)
Delitzsch (1876): 3–5.6–9.10–12.13–16.17–19.20–23.24–26 (8.10.6.8.6.8.6)
Wright (1883): 3.4–5.6–8a.8b–10.11–13|14–16.17–19.20–22.23–25.26 (2.4×6|4×6.2)
Dillmann (1891): 3.4–5.6–8a.8b–10|11–13.14–16.17–19|20–22.23–25.26 (20.18.14 > 2.6.6.6|6.6.6|6.6.2); cf. Wright (1883)
Bickell (1894): 3–4b.5a–b+6b–c.7–8a+9a.9b–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.20–21.23–24.25–26
Ley (1895): 3–5.6–9.10–13.14–16.17–19.20–22.23–26 (4.4.4.3.3.3.4)

Duhm (1897): 3–4a+9b.4b–5b.5c–6.7–8.9–10|11+16.13–14.15+17.18–19|20–21.22–23.25–26 (5×4|4×4|3×4)

Vetter (1897): 3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10|11–12.13–14.15–16.17–19|20–21.22–23.24–26 (2.2.2.2|2.2.2.3|2.2.3)

Hontheim (1904): 3–6|7–9+3||10–12||13–16.17–19+3|20–23.24–26+3 (4.4|3|8.8)

Schlögl (1916): 3–5+8.6+9–10+7|11–12.13–19.20–26 (10.10|4.14.14)

Löhr (1918): 3.4b–c+5a–b+6b–c.7+9a+c+10|12+11+16.13–15.17–19.20–22.24–26 (1.3.3|5×3)

Dhorme (1926): 3.4–5.6+9.7–8+10.11–12+16.13–15.17–19.20–23.24–26 (2.6.6.6. . .)

Peters (1928): 3.4–6.7–8.9–10|11–12.13–14.15–16.17–19|20–22.23–24.25–26 (1.3.2.2|2.2.2.3|3.2.2)

Condamin (1933), pp. 193–95: 3–4.5–6|7–8.9–10|11.12|13–16.17–19|20–23.24–26 (2.2|2.2|1.1|4.3|4.3)

Irwin (1946): 3–4*+8.7+9–10*.11+16+12.13–15.17–19.20–22.24–26 (7×3)

Möller (1955): 3.4–10.11–19.20–26 (1.7.9.7)

Skehan (1961): 3–6.7–10.11+16+12|13–15.17–19.20–23.24–26 (4.4.3|3.3.4.3)

Fohrer (1963): 3+4b–5a+c+6b–9a+c–10.11–15+17–19.20–26 (8.8.7)

Terrien (1963): 3–7.8–10|11–12.13–16.17–19|20–23.24–26

Epping-Nelis (1968): 3–6.7–10|11+16+12–15.17–19|20–23.24–26; cf. NAB (1970)

Freedman (1968): 3.4–5.6–9.10|11–12.*13*–15.16.17–19|20–22.23.24–*26* (8.9.7 lines and 20.28.14 cola, cf. Dillmann [1891]; vv. 3–13.14–26 > 26.26 cola)

TOB (1978): 3–6.7–10|11–16.17–19|20–23.24–26

KBS (1980): 3.4–6.7–10.11–19.20–23.24–26

De Wilde (1981): 3–4b.4c–5.6a+9b+6b–c.7–8.9a+c+10|11–12+16.13–15.17–19|20–21.22–23.24–26

Van Selms (1982): 3–10.11–19.20–26 (8.9.7)

Webster (1983): 3–6.7–10.11–15.16–19.20–23.24–26

Habel (1985): 3.4–5.6–9.10(a.b.b’.a’)|11.12.13–15.16.17–19.20.21–22.23.24–26 (a.b.c.b’.c’.b’’.c’’.b’’’.a’); cf. Schlögl (1916) and Löhr (1918)

Bezuidenhout (1986): 3–5.6–7.8–10|11–12.13–15.16–19|20–23.24–26

Michel (1987): 3.4–5.6–10.11–12.13–15.16–19.20–24.25–26

Hartley (1988): 3–10.11–*13*|14–23.24–*26* (a.b|a’.b’; 26.26); cf. Wright (1883) and Freedman (1968)

Clines (1989): 3.4–5.6–9.10|11–12.13–15.16.17–19|20.21–22.23.24–26

MacKenzie (1990): 3–6.7–10|11+16+12.13–15.17–19|20–23.24–26
(4.4|3.3.3|4.3)
Jacobsen-Nielsen (1992), pp. 203–04:[1] 3|4–5a.5b–c+6b–c|7–8.6a+9|10
(2|4.4|4.4|2; a|b.c|c'.b'|a')

2.6 Comments and summary

The first poem of the book of Job is an emotional outburst of the hero of the speech-cycles. The composition stands out for its vivid portrayal of a man who is at a complete loss and who is longing for death. Although it is not disputed that the poet of our book combines 'awesome expressive power with dazzling stylistic virtuosity' (Alter [1985], p. 77), I nevertheless observe some dithyramb-like features here, which make this opening outburst distinguish itself from the succeeding poems.

To a certain extent the poem is a fine illustration of the technique the Hebrew poets applied to shape their compositions. Job's opening curse consists of three main parts, which display an almost identical number of lines: vv. 3–10, where Job curses the day and the night of his birth; vv. 11–19, where he wonders why he did not die immediately after he was born; and vv. 20–26, where he complains about the fact that the lives of suffering people are senselessly drawn out (cf. anal. 2.2). This division is traditionally adopted by most scholars.[2] The division is supported by the phenomenon that the second and the third main parts open in a similar fashion, namely with the interrogative pronoun *lmh* ('why?'); see about this device furthermore below.

However, recent investigation into the formal skeleton of ch. 3 apparently points to a bipartite structure. From a form-critical perspective Habel assumes that vv. 11–26 constitute a coherent whole, which distinguishes itself as the 'lament' from the preceding 'curse' (vv. 3–10).[3] So, Habel ignores a major disjunction between vv. 19 and 20. This exegete does not note, however, that the *ky*-clause in v. 13 establishes the reason for the opening lament of v. 11. This creates a linear parallelism with the *ky*-clauses in vv. 24–25, which establish the reason for the opening lament of v. 20 (cf. Habel, pp. 102–03). Hartley also distinguishes between a curse and a lament, but this exegete assumes that the curse winds up with v. 13.[4] On the basis of Jer. 20,14–18 Hartley correctly points out that the interrogative line beginning with *lmh* (‘why?) in v. 11 is an integral part of the curse of the day of one’s birth; note Jer. 20,18 (see below and Hartley, p. 88 n. 2). But it is hard to understand now, why Hartley does not incorporate the why?-sentence of v. 20 in this observation. I conclude that vv. 11–26 in their entirety cannot be disconnected from the fist main unit, as a lament from a preceding curse (against Habel).

---

[1] Th. Jacobsen and K. Nielsen, 'Cursing the Day', *SJOT* 6 (1992), pp. 187–204.

[2] See Köster, Ewald, Dillmann, Duhm, Vetter, Peters, Fohrer, Terrien, Epping-Nelis, Freedman, TOB, De Wilde, Van Selms, Clines, MacKenzie in anal. 2.5.

[3] Cf. Schlögl and Löhr in anal. 2.5.

[4] With reference to the investigation by Fishbane; see M. Fishbane, 'Jeremiah 4,23–26 and Job 3,3–13: A recovered use of the creation pattern', *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 151–67. See

In my opinion, cantos II and III of Job’s curse can be seen as an extensive development of Jer. 20,18. This line forms an integral part of the poem(/canto) of Jer. 20,14–18. The section involved consists of four 2-line strophes, which two by two form a higher structural unit:

I [14] **’rwr** *hYWM*   **’šr** *yldty bw*
YWM ’šr yldtny ’MY   *’l YHY brwk*

[15] **’rwr** *H’YŠ* **’šr** *bśr*   *’t ’by l’mr*
yld lk bn zkr   *śmḥ śmḥhw*

II [16] **whyh** *H’YŠ hhw’ k‘rym*   *’šr hpk yhwh wl’ nḥm*
wšm‘ z‘qh bbqr   *wtrw‘h b‘t ṣhrym*

[17] *’šr l’ mwttny mrḥm*   *wTHY ly ’MY qbry*   *wrḥmh hrt ‘wlm*
[18] *lmh zh mrḥm yṣ’ty*   *lr’wt ‘ml wygwn*   *wyklw bbšt YMy*

The verbal repetitions on the level of the section as a whole display a symmetric pattern. See for this symmetry *ywm*, *’my* and *yhy/thy* in strophes one and four; and *h’yš*, *śmḥ/z‘q* in strophes two and three. The section is rounded off by a strophe with two tricola. The final tricolon (v. 18) opens with the interrogative *lmh* (‘why’?). Within the poem of Job 3 this final line is worked out into two relatively independent cantos, cantos II and III. Just like Jer. 20,18 these cantos have as their initial word the interrogative pronoun *lmh* (‘why?’), vv. 11a and 20a. See furthermore *mrḥm* in Jer. 20,18 and Job 3,11; *yṣ’ty* in Jer. 20,18 and Job 3,11; the root *r’h* in Jer. 20,18 and Job 3,16; *‘ml* in Jer. 20,18 and Job 3,20 (and 10). The repetition by *lmh* creates an anaphora on the level of the cantos and must be observed as an unequivocal, formal device, which supports the tripartite structure of Job 3. Some commentaries explicitly mention this phenomenon (for instance, Dillmann, Freedman, Horst and Clines). Here we meet with the first clear *responsio* on the level of the cantos. But there is more to be said here.

Duhm pointed out that v. 16 cannot be in the right place in MT, but

---

for this bipartite structure also Wright and Freedman (1968, p. 506); and cf. Skehan in anal. 2.5.

is to be read in the context of vv. 11 and 12. When we transpose v. 16 to follow v. 12 (see anal. 2.1), then, it is obvious that the second canto is built up of three 3-line strophes: vv. 11–12+16, 13–15 and 17–19;[5] see anal. 2.2 and *'w* and *nwḥ* in anal. 2.4.3. By comparing the first strophe of this canto (vv. 11–12+16) with the first two lines of canto III (vv. 20–21) another three responsions can be pointed out; see *mwt* ('to die'), *ṭmn* ('to hide'), and *'wr* ('light') in anal. 2.4.4. The repetition of the root *ṭmn* is rather conspicuous. We do not come across this root before Job 18,10.[6] So, the beginning of cantos II and III is formally indicated by a fourfold verbal repetition.

Next, this linear, external parallelism between cantos II and III is not confined to the beginning of these units. Analysis 2.4.4 makes it clear that this linear parallelism also determines the succeeding lines of the cantos; see the responsions *ky*, *šqṭ* ('to be quiet'), *rgz* ('turmoil'), *nwḥ* ('to be at rest'). So, from this formal point of departure, the cantos in their entirety obviously display a linear parallel structure.[7]

Canto I only partially ties in with this linear pattern; see *gbr* ('man'), *'lwh* ('God'), and *kmryry*/*mry* in anal. 2.4.4. Rather, the canto as a whole corresponds with the opening lines of cantos II and III; see anal. 2.4.4.[8]

Just like Jer. 20,14–18 canto I displays a symmetric structure. This symmetry in the first place comes to light when we take into account its strophic skeleton: 1.3.3.1. In the first line of canto I Job formulates a malediction of a special *day* (v. 3a) and a special *night* (v. 3b). This line can be seen as the theme of the canto (see about this line furthermore below). The *ky*-clause in the final line of the canto (v. 10) also applies both to the day and the night. This line formulates the reason for the malediction and so indirectly ties in with v. 3. Next, the curse of the day is elaborated in the 3-line strophe of vv. 4–6, and the curse of the night in the 3-line strophe of vv. 7–9 (see anal. 2.2). The symmetric structure of canto I is finally indicated by a number of verbal repetitions, which are described in anal. 2.4.3; see *'l* (prohib.), *kmryry ywm*/ *'rry ywm*, *hlylh hhw'*, *bw'*.[9] The strophic structure of this canto is partially supported by analyses 2.3.1.1 and 2.4.2.

---

[5] So also Löhr, Dhorme, Irwin, Skehan, De Wilde, MacKenzie; cf. Dillmann and Wright in anal. 2.5.

[6] See furthermore 20,26 31,33 40,13 (twice).

[7] Freedman (1968) only selectively makes use of the device of verbal repetition when he points to 'a curious affinity' between vv. 13 and 26, with reference to the roots *šqṭ* and *nwḥ*. Next, this criticism also applies to the observations with regard to the bipartite structure of this poem by Hartley.

[8] This analysis makes it clear that the noun *gbr* cannot be taken as an instance of 'envelope structure'; against Alter (1985, p. 82).

[9] Cf. for the symmetric structure of canto I also Jacobsen-Nielsen (1992) in anal. 2.5; and note for the disjunction between vv. 6 and 7 furthermore Hontheim, Condamin,

In canto III vv. 24–26 deal with Job's sufferings. These lines clearly distinguish themselves as a relatively independent strophe from the preceding lines, which deal with the suffering of mankind in general (vv. 20–23).[10] From a syntactical perspective vv. 20–23 constitute a symmetrical pattern (a.b.b'.a'; Webster, p. 37). V. 23 depends on *lmh* in v. 20, and vv. 21 and 22 form an external parallelism.[11] It must be conceded that this strophic division is not strengthened by the device of responsio in canto III (cf. anal. 2.4.3).

This rhetorical analysis indicates that the *leading idea* of the poem is partly to be found in the first canto: *Job curses the day of his birth and the night of his conception.* This idea is most tersely formulated in the opening line of the poem, v. 3. The following lines of the canto (vv. 4–10) 'merely' work out this main thought.

Within this context the *lmh*-cantos (II and III) form indispensable building blocks (see above). When we take into account the number of the cola in Job 3, vv. 16+13 appear to mark the pivotal lines; vv. 3–12 and 14–15+17–26 represent 24 cola each. At the same time it can be observed that these pivotal lines represent a *thematic midpoint*, too (cf. v. 3): *would it be that I never saw the light of life, then I would enjoy rest.*[12] Together with the opening line of Job 3 (v. 3) these pivotal lines form the key thought of the poem. In v. 3 we find the *objective* malediction of Job's origin, in vv. 16+13 the *subjective* filling-in of the preceding curse.

Skehan, Epping-Nelis, TOB, KBS, Webster, MacKenzie.

[10] See for this strophic division also Stickel, Delitzsch, Hontheim, Dhorme, Condamin, Skehan, Terrien, Epping-Nelis, TOB, KBS, Webster and MacKenzie.

[11] So, the third-person reference *lgbr* in v. 23 does not directly point to Job; against Alter (1985, p. 82) and cf. Clines (pp. 75 and 100–01).

[12] Cf. with this approach Freedman (1968, p. 506) and the view by Clines, that the *nodal verse* of the poem is v. 26; note *šqṭ* and *nwḥ* in vv. 13 and 26. Cf. furthermore Alter's analysis of Job 3. According to this critic the poem is a fine example of the 'generative principle of intensification' (1985, p. 80).

3 Eliphaz’s first speech (1): Job 4

Structure: 10.10 > 5.5|5.5 > 3.2|3.2||3.2|3.2

I.1	2	H*nsh DBR* ’LYK TL’H	*w‘ṣr bmlyn* **my** *ywkl*
	3	*hnh ysrt RBYM*	*wydym rpwt tḥzq*
	4	*kwšl yqymwn mlyk*	*wbrkym kr‘wt t’mṣ*
	5	*ky ‘th tbw’* ’LYK *w*TL’	*tg‘ ‘dyk wtbhl*
	6	H*l’ yr’tk ksltk*	*tqwtk wtm drkyk*
I.2	7	*zkr n’* **my** *hw’ nqy* ’BD	*w’yph yšrym nkḥdw*
	8	*k’ŠR r’yty ḥršy ’wn*	*wzr‘y ‘ml yqṣrhw*
	9	*mnšmt ’LWH* Y’BDW	*wmrwḥ ’pw yklw*
	10	*š’gt ’ryh wqwl šḥl*	*wšny kpyrym nt‘w*
	11	*lyš ’BD MBLY ṭrp*	*wbny lby’ ytprdw*

II.1	12	W*’ly DBR ygnb*	*wtqḥ ’zny šmṣ mnhw*	
	13	*bś‘pym mḥzynwt lylh*	*bnpl trdmh ‘l ’nšym*	
	14	*pḥd qr’ny wr‘dh*	*wRB ‘ṣmwty hpḥyd*	
	15	W*rwḥ ‘l pny yḥlp*	*tsmr ś‘rt bśry*	
	16	*y‘md wl’ ’kyr mr’hw*	*tmwnh lngd ‘yny*	*dmmh wqwl ’šm‘*
II.2	17	H*’nwš m’LWH yṣdq*	*’m m‘śhw yṭhr gbr*	
	18	*hn b‘bdyw l’ y’myn*	*wbml’kyw yśym thlh*	
	19	*’p škny bty ḥmr*	*’ŠR b‘pr yswdm*	*ydk’wm lpny ‘š*
	20	*mbqr l‘rb yktw*	*MBLY mśym lnṣḥ Y’BDW*	
	21	H*l’ ns‘ ytrm bm*	*ymwtw wl’ bḥkmh*	

3.1 Text

V. 2a—*hnsh*: *h-* interr. + 3 m. sg. perf. niph‘al of *nsh* (‘to dare’); so HAL and cf. Habel. Dhorme and Clines take the form as an orthographic variant for *hnś’*: *h-* interr. + 1 pl. impf. qal of *nś’* (‘to lift up’); cf. Ps. 4,7.

V. 6b—*wtm*: the *w* is emphatic (Pope, Habel).

V. 15b—*ś‘rt*: ‘storm, whirlwind’, an archaic feminine absolute; so M. Dahood, *Biblica* 48 (1967), pp. 544–45 (Gordis, Habel, Clines, Michel). See further J. Lust, *Bijdragen* 36 (1975), pp. 308–11 and S.M. Paul, *ZAW* 95 (1983), pp. 119–21. But cf. also Dhorme, De Wilde and HAL (‘hair’).

V. 18b—*thlh*: ‘folly’ (Dhorme, Clines); HAL: ‘Irrtum’, or ‘Verrücktheit’. According to Michel *l’* in v. 18a has double duty force and *thlh* is ‘praise, glory’; cf. Ps. 106,12 (note *’mn* + *thlh*).

V. 21a—*ytrm*: ‘their tent cord’; so MT (Fohrer, Horst, HAL, Habel, Hartley, Cotter, Michel). Others read *ytdm* (‘their tent peg’; Hölscher, De Wilde, Clines).

3.2 Content

Eliphaz’s introductory speech: no one is innocent before God.

- I Eliphaz’s personal view.
  - I.1 Eliphaz calls on Job to be confident—preparation (Job central).
    - I would like to say something to you, who always cheered up with words weak people (vv. 2–4).
    - Now, you yourself must be confident also when you meet with adversity (vv. 5–6).
  - I.2 Eliphaz’s wisdom—message of doom.
    - God only punishes those who do injustice on earth (vv. 7–9).
    - The same thought expressed in a metaphor: it turns out badly for animals of prey (vv. 10–11).
- II The nightly revelation.
  - II.1 Description of a nightly vision—preparation (Eliphaz central).
    - In the night I was frightened by a vision (vv. 12–14).
    - I descried a figure, who spoke to me (vv. 15–16).
  - II.2 The content of the revelation—message of doom.
    - A human being is never innocent before God (vv. 17–19).
    - Therefore people die dishonourably (vv. 20–21).

3.3 Transition markers

3.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

3.3.1.1 *h-* interr., v. 2a
my, v. 2b
‘th, v. 5a
imperative: *zkr*, v. 7a
n’, v. 7a
my, v. 7a
hw’, v. 7a
’yph, v. 7b
w- beginning line, v. 12a
w- beginning line, v. 15a
h- interr., v. 17a
’nwš, v. 17a

3.3.1.2 no remarks

3.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

3.3.2.1 *tqwh*, v. 6b
’p, v. 19a

3.3.2.2 *h-* interr., v. 6a
h- interr., v. 21a

3.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

hnh, v. 3a
hn, v. 18a
lnṣḥ, v. 20b (however, note the last strophe)

3.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

3.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’bd*, vv. 7, 9, 11, 20; *’l* (prep.), vv. 2, 5, 12; *’lwh*, vv. 9, 17; *’šr*, vv. 8, 19
b: *b-*, vv. 2, 13, 13, 18, 18, 19, 21, 21; *bly*, vv. 11, 20
d: *dbr*, vv. 2, 12
h: *h-* interr., vv. 2, 6, 17, 21; *-hw*, vv. 8, 12, 16, 17
w: *-w*, vv. 9, 18, 18
y: *-y*, vv. 12, 12, 14, 15, 15, 16 (cf. also *-ny* in v. 14a)
k: *-k*, vv. 2, 4, 5, 5, 6 (4×)
l: *l-*, vv. 16, 19, 20, 20; *l’*, vv. 6, 16, 18, 21, 21; *l’h*, vv. 2, 5
m: *-m*, vv. 19, 19, 21, 21; *my*, vv. 2, 7; *mlh*, vv. 2, 4; *mn*, vv. 9, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 17, 20, 20
‘: *‘l*, vv. 13, 15
p: *pnym*, vv. 15, 19
q: *qwl*, vv. 10, 16
r: *r’h*, vv. 8, 16; *rb*, vv. 3, 14; *rwḥ*, vv. 9, 15
ś: *śym*, vv. 18, 20

3.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–4: *-k*, vv. 2a.4a—inclusio
mlyn, vv. 2b.4a—inclusio!
vv. 5–6: *-k*, vv. 5a+b.6 (4×)
vv. 7–9: *’bd*, vv. 7a.9a—inclusio
vv. 12–14: *-y*, vv. 12a+b.14b—inclusio; see also *-ny* in v. 14a
mn, vv. 12b.13a
vv. 15–16: *-y*, vv. 15b.16b—linear; see also v. 15a
vv. 17–19: *b-*, vv. 18a+b.19b
vv. 20–21: *’bd/mwt*, vv. 20b and 21b resp.; cf. Job 28,22—Ceresko (1980), pp. 124 and 237

3.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 2–6 (I.1): *h*- interr., vv. 2a.6a—inclusio
-k, vv. 2a+4a.5a+b+6 (4×)!
'lyk, vv. 2a.5a!—linear
l'h, vv. 2a.5a!—linear
vv. 7–11 (I.2): *'bd*, vv. 7a+9a.11a
mn, vv. 9a+b.11a—linear
vv. 12–15 (II.1): *w*- beginning line, vv. 12a.15a—exactly linear
-y, vv. 12a+b+14b.15a+b+16b!
-hw, vv. 12b.16a—inclusio
'l, vv. 13b.15a!
vv. 17–21 (II.2): *h*- interr., vv. 17a.21a—inclusio
mn, vv. 17a+b.20a+b—linear
b-, vv. 18a+b+19b.21a+b
b'bdyw/y'bdw, vv. 18a and 20b resp.—alliter.
śym, vv. 18b.20b!
-m, vv. 19b+c.21a (2×)!—linear
l-, vv. 19c.20a+b—concatenatio

3.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–11 (canto I): *my*, vv. 2b.7a!—linear

vv. 12–21 (canto II): *-hw*, vv. 12b.17b—linear; but cf. also v. 16a
'nšym/'nwš, vv. 13b and 17a resp.—linear
pnym, vv. 15a.19c!

3.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

The linear arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 2–6.12–16: *dbr*, vv. 2a.12a—exactly linear!
'l, vv. 2a.12a—linear; see also v. 5a!
rb, vv. 3a.14b!—linear

vv. 7–11.17–21: *'šr*, vv. 8a.19b!—linear
mn + *'lwh*, vv. 9a.17a!—linear
'p ('nose')/*'p* ('more'), vv. 9b and 19a resp.! (alliter.) —linear

-w (as reference to God), vv. 9b.18a+b!—linear
’bd, vv. 11a.20b—linear; see also vv. 7a+9a!, and *mwt* in v. 21b
mbly, vv. 11a.20b!—linear

The symmetric arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 2–6.17–21: *hnsh/hl’ ns‘*, vv. 2a and 21a resp. (alliter.)—exactly symmetric
h- interr., vv. 2a+6a.17a+21a!; note *hl’* in vv. 6a and 21a!
tl’h/thlh, vv. 2a and 18a resp. (alliter.)—Cotter (1992), pp. 189–90

vv. 7–11.12–16: *r’h*, vv. 8a.16a!—exactly symmetric
mn, vv. 9a+b+11a.12b+13a
rwḥ, vv. 9b.15a!—exactly symmetric
qwl, vv. 10a.16c!

3.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

3.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
b-, *-hw* (v. 8), *l-* (v. 16), *l’*

3.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
none

3.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–6.7–11.12–16.17–21|... (4×5|...); cf. Stickel (1842)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–6.7–11|12–16.17–21||... (5.5|5.5||...)
Ewald (1854): 2–6.7–11|12–16.17–21...; cf. Epping-Nelis (1968)
Merx (1871): 2–5.6–9*.12–15|16–18.19–21|... (3×8|7.7|...)
Hitzig (1874): 2–11.12–21... (10.10...)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–5.6–11.12–16.17–21|... (8.12.11.11|...)
Wright (1883): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11|12–13.14–15.16.17–18.19.20–21||... (5×4|4.4.3.4.3.4||...)
Dillmann (1891): 2–6.7–11||12–16.17–21|... (10.10||11.11|...)
Bickell (1894): 3+5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16a+c–17.18–19b.20–21...
Ley (1895): 2–6.7–11.12–16.17–21... (4×5...); similarly Skehan (1961) and MacKenzie (1990); cf. Webster (1983)

Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5.6–7[.8–9.10–11]|12–13.14–15.16*.17–18.19–21*|. . .
Vetter (1897): (2) 3–5|6–7.8–9.10–11|12–13.14–16.17–18.19–21|. . .
Hontheim (1904): 2-6.7–11|12–16b.16c–21||. . . (10.10|. . .)
Müller (1907), pp. 79–82: 2–6.7–11|12–16.17–21 (10.10|11.11); cf. Dillmann (1891)
Schlögl (1916): 2–5.6–9.10–11|12–16.17–21 (8.8.4|11.11.)
Löhr (1918): 2|3–4.5*.6–7.8–9|12–13.14–15.16c+a+17.18–19a+c|. . . (1|4×2|4×2|. . .)
Ball (1922): 2–3.4-5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16*.17-18.19–20a. . .
Peters (1928): 2.3–5|6–8.9–11|12–13.14–16.17–19.20–21|. . . (1.3|3.3|2.3|3.2|. . .)
König (1929): 2–5.6–11.12–16.17–21. . .; cf. Weiser (1968)
Condamin (1933), pp. 196–201: 2–4.5–6.7–9.10–11|12–13.14–16.17–18. 19–21|. . . (3.2.3.2|2.3.2.3|. . .)
Kissane (1939): 2–6.7–11|12–16.17–21|. . . (4×5); cf. Fohrer (1963)
Kroeze (1961): 2–5.6–11.12–17.18–21. . .
Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–11||12–13.14–16|17–18.19–21||. . . (3.2|3.2|| 2.3|2.3||. . .); cf. Condamin (1933)
Horst (1968): 2–11.12–21. . . (10|5.5|. . .)
Andersen (1976), p. 111: 2.3–6.7–11.12–21. . . (a.b.c.d. . .)
TOB (1978): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–11|12–16|17–21|. . .
KBS (1980): 2.3-11.12–21. . .
Murphy (1981): 2|3–4.5–6||7–9.10–11||12–16||17.18–19.20–21||. . . (4×5. . .)
De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–14.15–16.17–19b.19c+5,5b+ 20–21|. . .
Van Selms (1982): 2–6.7–11.12–21. . .; similarly Hartley (1988)
Habel (1985): 2–11.12–21. . . > 2.3–5.6.7.8–9.10–11|12–16.17–19.20–21. . .
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–5||6–7.8–11.12–14.15–16.17–19.20–21|. . .
Michel (1987): 2–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–16.17–21
Clines (1989): 2–6.7–11|12–16.17–21|. . .
Cotter (1992): 2.3–4.5–6|7.8–9.10–11|12.13–14.15–16|17.18–19b.19c–21

3.6 Comments and summary

The first speech of Eliphaz encompasses two chapters. Most modern commentators do not take this chapter division very seriously. In my opinion, however, the division is aptly made. We have to do with two relatively independent poems. And the chapter division exactly indicates the separation between the one and the other.[1] Among other things, I hope to demonstrate that the macrostructure of the poems in question supports this view.

---

[1] So also Köster, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Wright, Schlögl, and recently Webster and Cotter.

It is generally accepted that ch. 4 consists of four units of five masoretic verses each: vv. 2–6, 7–11, 12–16, 17–21 (see anal. 3.5). This consensus is based on the very clear, thematic framework of the poem on the level of the canticles (see anal. 3.2). Some critics moreover assume that these five-line units, in pairs, form higher units: vv. 2–11 and 12–21 (Schlottmann, Hontheim, Müller, Condamin, Kissane, Terrien). Again from a thematic point of view, it may be noted that vv. 12–21 (the description of Eliphaz's nightly vision) clearly distinguish themselves from the foregoing verses. Next, vv. 2–11 concentrate on the person of Job, vv. 12–21 focus on the person of Eliphaz himself (see anal. 3.2).[2] This division, then, is supported by linear, semantic parallelism between the higher units, the cantos. This semantic parallelism is most obvious when we consider the *message* each canto contains; note canticles I.2 and II.2 (see anal. 3.2). In the first canto this message is especially introduced by the imperative *zkr* ('remember'), v. 7. In the second canto the beginning of the message is especially marked by the last words of canticle II.1: *wqwl 'šm'* ('and I heard a voice'), v. 16.[3] The messages themselves express the refrain-like thought of the *ruin*, the *uncreation* (Cotter) of the wicked/mankind (in general).[4] Both first halves of the cantos (canticles I.1 and II.1) may be taken as preparatory to the proper message of the poem. The theme of these preparations is formulated in the first colon of the units: Eliphaz 'dares a *word*' to Job (v. 2a), 'because' he himself received a '*word*' (v. 12a). This parallelism between the cantos is one of the most important characteristics of the poem, I think, but did not receive due attention by former critics.

To this point the reasoning concerning the scope of the cantos and the canticles was based on thematic grounds alone. The verbal repetitions the poet wove into his composition support this framework of ideas. The second word in the first line of both cantos is the noun *dbr* ('word'), vv. 2a and

---

[2] These verses surely do not contain an unmarked quotation of a nightly vision Job experienced before, as is recently proposed by Smith; see G.V. Smith, 'Job 4,18–21: is it Eliphaz's vision?', *VT* 40 (1990), pp. 453–63. Smith's interpretation overlooks the fact that 5,1 and 15,17 are the beginning of a new poem (and therefore do not directly tie in with the preceding lines; against pp. 456 and 459) and is at odds with Job's repeated desire in the following speeches for an answer from God (note ch. 23; against p. 463).

[3] Vv. 7 and 17 are characterized by Habel as 'topic sayings' (p. 123); note the external parallelism.

[4] Cf. D.J.A. Clines, 'Verb modality and the interpretation of Job 4,20–21', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 354–57.

12a.[5] This responsio is strengthened by the repetition of the preposition *'l*, which in v. 2a follows *dbr* and in v. 12a precedes this root. The end of the cantos is marked by the root *'bd* ('to destroy'), and by *mbly* ('without'); see anal. 3.4.5. That is to say, in the second canto these responsions occur in the penultimate line. Cotter points out that both cantos end with a tour, i.e., 'a list of several synonyms for the same thing'.[6] The tour in vv. 10-11 offers five words for 'lion'; cf. also the tour of synonyms for death and destruction in vv. 7–11. Like the first, the tour in vv. 20–21 offers synonyms for death; see especially *yktw*, *y'bdw*, *ymwtw*. Next, the phenomenon of verbal responsio is not restricted to the beginning and the end of the cantos, but extends over the corresponding canticles in their entirety. That is to say, canticle I.1 parallels II.1, and canticle I.2 parallels II.2; see especially *rb* and *'lwh* in anal. 3.4.5.

In addition to this linear arrangement of the canticles within the composition as a whole, we must assume a deliberately symmetric order as well. The most obvious evidence of this pattern is provided by *hnsh/hl' ns'* at the very beginning of the first and the last line of the poem. The exclusive use of the words *r'h* ('to see'), *rwḥ* ('spirit') and *qwl* ('voice') in I.2 and II.1 seems to fit this symmetric framework very well; see anal. 3.4.5 too. This symmetric arrangement of the cantos, as far as I can see, is a purely formal phenomenon and has no clear thematic meaning.

The canticles themselves show distinct rhetorical characteristics, too; see anal. 3.4.3. The first and the fourth canticles are marked by inclusio; see *h-* interr. The first and the third canticles are marked by the exclusive use of the suffixes *-k* and *-y* respectively; note also the linear parallelism. The beginning of the first two canticles is marked by *my*; see anal. 3.4.4.

As to the level of the strophes less unanimity can be observed among critics; see anal. 3.5. Condamin, Terrien and TOB correctly assume an alternation of three- and two-line strophes in the first canto; cf. also Murphy and Cotter. According to Hontheim (1904, p. 103), Condamin and Terrien the 3.2-strophic pattern of the first part of the poem is reversed in the second part into a 2.3 pattern. In view of vv. 17–19 this reversal of the strophic pattern is not very likely. We are probably dealing here with a 'standard' strophic unit; cf. 15,14–16 and 25,4–6 and see also *'p* in anal. 3.3.2.1. In my opinion, the strophes form a linear 3.2 pattern from the beginning to the end of the poem; cf. Cotter. As to the strophes of canticle I.1 the 3.2 pattern is clearly supported by the repetition of *'lyk tl'h*, *'lyk wtl'* ('to you [and] you are irritated'; anal. 3.4.3); note furthermore anal.

---

[5] From his translation—note the spacing of 'Wort' (p. 80)—we may conclude that Müller (1907) too understood the repetition of this root as 'Wortresponsion'.

[6] Cotter (1992), p. 197.

3.2. See also the transition marker *'th* in v. 5a. The second strophe of I.2 (vv. 10–11) especially distinguishes itself from the preceding one by the use of metaphorical language.[7] For the strophes in canticle II.1 see especially *w-* at the beginning of vv. 12 and 15.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the poet adapted the 'standard' strophe vv. 17–19 to the verbal patterns of the macrostructure of this special composition. In 15,14 and 25,4 the strophes open with the interrogative *mh*. The substitution of this word by *h-* interrogative makes the strophe fit the last canticle (see *h-* interr. in v. 21), and in the composition as a whole (see *h-* interr. in vv. 2-6). The word 'God' does not occur in 15,14–16, in 25,4 we find *'l*. The substitution by *'lwh* in v. 17 is prompted by *'lwh* in v. 9. The parallel word *'śh* in v. 17b is unique here. Cotter rightly points out that this feature is connected with the theme of 'uncreation' of the canticles I.2 and II.2.[8] Even the relative pronoun *'šr* in v. 19 appears to be prompted by the pattern of verbal repetitions on the level of the cantos; see *'šr* in v. 8. This pronoun is neither used in 15,14–16, nor in 25,4–6! The substitution of *'m* (25,4a) by the prep. *mn* in v. 17a and b is obviously connected with the same repetitive parallelism in v. 20 (see anal. 3.4.3; cf. suffix *-m* at the end of the same strophes!). Cf. also the alliteration *b'bdyw/y'bdw* (anal. 3.4.3); the noun *'bd* ('servant') is not used in 15,14–16 and 25,4–6. In my opinion, this comparison proves that an analysis of the verbal repetitions has to reckon with the verbal repetitions of apparently insignificant words, too. These repetitions, namely, may play a part in the determination of the macrostructure of a poem from the level of the strophes to the level of the cantos.

On the basis of this rhetorical analysis I conclude that in the poem of ch. 4 we are dealing with two cantos, which are primarily typified by a linear external parallelism. The *main thought* of the poem we find in the last canticle (II.2): a human being *may/must die* when confronted with God. This message of destruction is presaged in the parallel canticle of canto I (I.2).

---

[7] Cf., e.g., the strophe of Ps. 1,3–4.

[8] 'Job is reminded that it is God who made, and can, by logical extension, unmake'; Cotter (1992), p. 190.

4 Eliphaz’s first speech (2): Job 5

Structure: 7.9.10 1 > 5.2|7.2|7.3 1 > 1.2.2|2||1.3.3|2||1.3.3|3 1

I.1	1	*qr’ n’ hyš ‘wnk*	*W’L my mqdšym TPNH*	
	2	*KY l’wyl yhrg k‘ś*	*wpth TMYT qn’h*	
	3	*’NY r’yty ’wyl mšryš*	*w’qwb nwhw pt’m*	
	4	*yrḥqw bnyw myš‘*	*wydk’w bš‘r W’YN MṢYL*	
	5	*’šr qṣyrw R‘B y’kl*	*w’l mṣnym yqḥhw*	*wš’p ṣm’ym* [*ḥylm*
I.2	6	*KY l’ yṣ’ m‘pr ’wn*	*wm’dmh l’ yṣmḥ ‘ml*	
	7	*KY ’dm l‘ml ywld*	*wbny ršp ygbyhw ‘wp*	

II.1	8	*’wlm ’NY ’drš ’l ’̄L*	*W’L ’LHYM ’śym dbrty*
	9	‘ŚH *gdlwt W’YN ḥqr*	*npl’wt ‘d ’YN mspr*
	10	*hntn mṭr ‘l PNY ’rṣ*	*wšlḥ mym ‘l PNY ḥwṣwt*
	11	*lśwm šplym lmrwm*	*wqdrym śgbw yš‘*
	12	*mpr mḥšbwt ‘rwmym*	*wl’* T‘ŚYNH *ydyhm twšyh*
	13	*lkd ḥkmym b‘rmm*	*w‘ṣt nptlym nmhrh*
	14	*ywmm ypgšw ḥšk*	*wklylh ymššw bṣhrym*
II.2	15	*Wyš‘ mḥrb mpyhm*	*wmyd ḥzq ’bywn*
	16	*Wthy ldl tqwh*	*w‘lth qpṣh pyh*

III.1	17	*HNH ’šry ’nwš ywkḥnw ’LWH*	*wmwsr ŠDY ’l tm’s*
	18	*KY hw’ yk’yb wyḥbš*	*ymḥṣ wydw trpynh*
	19	*bšš ṣrwt YṢYLK*	*wbšb‘ l’ yg‘ bk r‘*
	20	*bR‘B pdk mMWT*	*wbmlḥmh mydy ḥrb*
	21	*bšwṭ lšwn tḥb’*	*wl’ tyr’ mšd ky ybw’*
	22	*lšd wlkpn tśḥq*	*wmḥyt h’rṣ ’l tyr’*
	23	*ky ‘m ’bny hśdh brytk*	*wḥyt hśdh hšlmh lk*
III.2	24	*Wyd‘t KY šlwm ’hlk*	*wpqdt nwk wl’ tḥṭ’*
	25	*Wyd‘t KY rb zr‘k*	*wṣ’ṣ’yk k‘śb h’rṣ*
	26	*tbw’ bklḥ ’ly qbr*	*k‘lwt gdyš b‘tw*

B [27] *HNH z’t ḥqrnwh kn hy’* *šm‘nh w’th d‘ lk*

4.1 Text

V. 3b—*w’qwb*: ‘and I declared cursed’ (Gordis, Habel, Hartley). Cf. Van Selms, Clines (also *Biblica* 62 [1981], pp. 192–93), and G. Brin, *VT* 42 (1992), pp. 391–93.

V. 5b: the meaning of MT is rather obscure. Hartley follows the emendation of Tur-Sinai and reads *w’lm ṣnym yqḥhw* (‘and [his] substance the starving will carry away’); so also Gordis.

V. 5c—*ṣm’ym*: ‘the thirsty’; see BHS (so Dhorme; Michel: ‘the Thirsty One’). MT *ṣmym* (‘snare’).

V. 7a—*ywld*: according to MT ‘he is born’ (pu‘al). Some critics read here a hiph‘il (‘he begets’; so Duhm, Dhorme, Gordis, Hartley, Clines), which fits the context better.

V. 7b: the meaning of this colon is in dispute; ‘and the sons of Pestilence fly high’ (Clines; cf. Habel, Michel and Hartley). See also G. Garbini, *Rivista di studi fenici* 20 (1992), pp. 93–94.

V. 15a—*mḥrb mpyhm*: a hendiadys, ‘from the sword, from their mouth’, i.e., ‘from their sharp tongue’ (Gordis, Hartley, Clines).

V. 23a—*’bny hśdh*: ‘stones of the field’ (Habel, Michel, Hartley, Clines, Cotter); ‘sons (i.e. demons) of the field’ (Blommerde; cf. Tur-Sinai and Pope).

4.2 Content

Eliphaz encourages Job to accept God’s punishment; then, he will be saved from death.

- I Do not foolishly address the Holy Ones.
  - I.1 You can address your complaint to no one (v. 1).
    The prosperity of a foolish person is only short-lived (vv. 2–3).
    Others walk off with his wealth (vv. 4–5).
  - I.2 *Conclusion*: the (wicked) person himself is the origin of all his misery (vv. 6–7).
- II God is the correct address to complain to.
  - II.1 You must address yourself to God (v. 8).
    He works great miracles for people who are in trouble (vv. 9–11).
    Smart and clever people are disappointed (vv. 12–14).
  - II.2 *Conclusion*: so, there is still hope for a weak person (vv. 15–16).

III You may face the future with confidence, when you accept God’s testing.
  III.1 A man may consider himself fortunate when he accepts God’s punishment (v. 17)
    For it is God who punishes, but saves from death too (vv. 18–20).
    Then, you have nothing or nobody to fear (vv. 21–23).
  III.2 *Summary*: that way, you look forward to a wonderful future (vv. 24–26).
B These are the facts, take this to heart! (v. 27).

4.3 Transition markers

4.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

4.3.1.1 imperative: *qr’*, v. 1a
n’, v. 1a
h- interr., v. 1a
my, v. 1b
’wlm, v. 8a
’ny, v. 8a
w- beginn. line, v. 15a; ext.
// *w-* beginn. line in v. 16a
hnh, v. 17a
’šry, v. 17a† (see Psalms)
’nwš, v. 17a
’l (prohib.), v. 17b
hw’, v. 18a
w- beginn. line, v. 24a; ext.
// *w-* beginn. line in v. 25a
hnh, v. 27a
z’t, v. 27a
imperative: *šm‘nh*, v. 27b
’th, v. 27b
imperative: *d‘*, v. 27b

4.3.1.2 *’l* (prohib.), v. 17b
hy’, v. 27a

4.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

4.3.2.1 *tqwh*, v. 16a

4.3.2.2 no remarks

4.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

’ny, v. 3a
’l (prohib.), v. 22b

4.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

4.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’dm*, vv. 6, 7; *’wyl*, vv. 2, 3; *’yn*, vv. 4, 9, 9; *’l* (prep.), vv. 1, 5*, 8, 8, 26 (*’ly*); *’l* (proh.), vv. 17, 22; *’l*/*’lhym*/*’lwh*, vv. 8a, 8b and 17 resp.; *’ny*,

vv. 3, 8; *'rṣ*, vv. 10, 22, 25

b: *b-*, vv. 4, 13, 14, 19 (3 ×), 20, 20, 21, 26, 26; *bw'*, vv. 21, 26; *bn*, vv. 4, 7

h: *h-* (article), vv. 10, 22, 23, 23, 25; *-h*, vv. 16, 27, 27; *-hm*, vv. 12, 15; *hnh*, vv. 17, 27

w: *-w*, vv. 4, 18, 26

ḥ: *ḥqr*, vv. 9, 27; *ḥrb*, vv. 15, 20; *ḥyt*, vv. 22, 23

y: *yd*, vv. 12, 15, 18, 20; *yd'*, vv. 24, 25, 27; *yr'*, vv. 21, 22; *yš'*, vv. 4, 11, 15

k: *k-*, vv. 14, 25, 26; *-k*, vv. 1, 19, 19, 20, 23, 23, 24, 24, 25, 25, 27; *ky*, vv. 2, 6, 7, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25

l: *l-*, vv. 2, 7, 11, 11, 16, 22, 22, 23, 27; *l'*, vv. 6, 6, 12, 19, 21, 24

m: *mwt*, vv. 2, 20; *mn*, vv. 1, 4, 6, 6, 15 (3×), 20, 20, 21, 22

n: *nwh*, vv. 3, 24; *nṣl*, vv. 4, 19

': *'l*, vv. 10, 10; *'ml*, vv. 6, 7; *'śh*, vv. 9, 12; *'rm*, vv. 12, 13

p: *ph*, vv. 15, 16; *pnh*, vv. 1, 10, 10

r: *r'b*, vv. 5, 20

ś: *śdh*, vv. 23, 23; *śym*, vv. 8, 11

š: *šdd*, vv. 21, 22; *šlm*, vv. 23, 24

4.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *'wyl*, vv. 2a.3a!
wpth tmyt/pt'm, vv. 2b and 3b resp.—alliteration
vv. 6–7: *ky*, vv. 6a.7a—exactly linear
'dm, vv. 6b.7a!
'ml, vv. 6b.7a!
vv. 12–14: *'rm*, vv. 12a.13a!—linear
b-, vv. 13a.14b
vv. 15–16: *ph*, vv. 15a.16b!
vv. 18–20: *yd*, vv. 18b.20b—inclusio
b-, vv. 19a+b (2×).20a+b
-k, vv. 19a+b.20a
vv. 21–23: *yr'*, vv. 21b.22b! } chiasm; see Ceresko, *UF* 7 (1975),
šdd, vv. 21b.22a!
pp. 82–83
ky, vv. 21b.23a—inclusio
l-, vv. 22a (2×).23b
ḥyt, vv. 22b.23b!—linear
h- (article), vv. 22b.23a+b
vv. 24–26: *wyd't ky*, vv. 24a.25a—exactly linear
k-, vv. 25b.26b

4.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 1–5 (I.1): *w’l*, vv. 1b.5b—inclusio
mn, vv. 1b.4a
vv. 8–14 (II.1): *śym*, vv. 8b.11a!—‘linear’ (*lśwm*, v. 11, ‘hängt von V. 8 ab’, Ehrlich)
‘śh, vv. 9a.12b!—linear
npl’wt/nptlym, vv. 9b and 13b resp.—alliteration
vv. 17–23 (III.1): *’l* (prohib.), vv. 17b.22b!
ky, vv. 18a.21b—linear; see also v. 23a
b-, vv. 19–20.21a—concatenatio
mn, vv. 20a+b.21b+22b—concatenatio

4.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–7 (canto I): *mn*, vv. 1b+4a.6a+b
ky, vv. 2a.6a+7a
bn, vv. 4a.7b!

vv. 8–16 (canto II): *l-*, vv. 11a (2×).16a
yd, vv. 12b.15b
-hm, vv. 12b.15a!

vv. 17–26 (canto III): *bw’*, vv. 21b.26a!
ky, vv. 23a.24a+25a—concatenatio
šlm, vv. 23b.24a—concatenatio

4.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 1.8.17: *w’l*, vv. 1b.8b—exactly linear; see also *’l* in v. 8a
’l (prep.)/ *’l* (proh.), vv. 8a and 17b resp.
’l (‘God’)/ *’lwh*, vv. 8a and 17a resp.—exactly linear
’lhym/šdy, vv. 8b and 17b resp.—exactly linear

vv. 1–5.8–14.17–23.27: *pnh*, vv. 1b.10a+b!
ky, vv. 2a.18a—exactly linear
mwt, vv. 2b.20a!
’ny, vv. 3a.8a!
w’yn, vv. 4b.9a; see also *’yn* in v. 9b!
nṣl, vv. 4b.19a!
r‘b, vv. 5a.20a!

ḥqr, vv. 9a.27a!
wl’, vv. 12b.21b—exactly linear; cf. also *wl’* in v. 24b
hnh, vv. 17a.27a!—exactly linear
lk, vv. 23b.27b!

vv. 6–7.15–16.24–26: *ky* ext. // *ky* (exactly lin.), vv. 6–7.24–25
w- ext. // *w-* (exactly lin.), vv. 15–16.24–25
mn, vv. 6a+b.15a (2×)

vv. 1–5.24–27, inclusio: *qr’ n’ h-*/*ḥqrnwh*, vv. 1a and 27a resp.—allit.
k‘ś/*k‘śb*, vv. 2a and 25b resp.—allit.
nwh, vv. 3b.24b!

4.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

4.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
b-, *h-* (article), *yd‘* (v. 27), *k-* (v. 14), *-k*, *l-*, *l’*, *mn*

4.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
’rṣ, *-h*, *-w*, *ḥrb*, *yš‘*, (*‘l*), (*śdh*)

4.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): . . . |1–2.3–7.8–11.12–16.17–18.19–23.24–27 (. . . |2.5.4.5.2.5.4)
Stickel (1842): . . . 1–5.6–10|11–16.17–21.22–26|27 (. . . 5.5|6.5.5|1)
Schlottmann (1851): . . . ||1–2.3–5.6–7|8–11.12–14.15–16|17–19.20–23.24–27 (. . . ||2.3.2|4.3.2|3.4.4)
Ewald (1854): . . . 1–5.6–7|8–16.17.18–26.27
Merx (1871): . . . |1–4.5–7.8–11.12–15.16–19.20–23.24–27 (. . . |7×8)
Hitzig (1874): . . . 1–7.8–16.17–27 (. . . 7.9.11)
Delitzsch (1876): . . . |1–5.6–11.12–16.17–21.22–26.27 (. . . |11.12.10.10.10.2)
Wright (1883): . . . ||1–2.3–4.5.6–7|8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15|16–17.18–19.20–21|22–23.24–25.26–27 (. . . ||4.4.3.4|4×4|3×4|3×4)
Dillmann (1891): . . . |1–5.6–7||8–11.12–16|17–21.22–26 27 (. . . |11.4||8.10|10.10 2)
Bickell (1894): . . . 1–2.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22.24–25.26–27; cf. Ball (1922)
Ley (1895): . . . 1–5.6–9+11.12–16.17–21.22–26|27 (. . . 5×5|1)
Vetter (1897): . . . |1–2.3–5.6–7|8–9.10–11.12–13.14–16.17–18.19–20.21–22.23–24.25–26 (27)

Hontheim (1904): . . . ||1–8||9–11+15|12–14+16||17–19||20–23|24–27 (. . . |8|4.4|3|4.4)
Schlögl (1916): 1–5a+5c–7.8–14.15–16|17–21.22–26.27 (14.14.4|10.10.2)
Löhr (1918): . . . |4,20b+21b+5,2.3+5a+c.4+1.6–7|8–9.11–12.13–14.15–16|17–18.19–20.21+23.24+26|27 (. . . |4×2|4×2|4×2)
Peters (1928): . . . |1–2.3–5.6–7|8–9.10–11.12–13.14–16|17–18.19–20.21–23.24–26.27 (. . . |2.3.2|4.5|2.2.3.3.1)
König (1929): . . . 1–7.8–16.17–26.27
Condamin (1933), pp. 196–201: . . . |1.2.3.4.5.6.7|8–10.11–13.14–16.17|18–20.21–23.24–26.27 (7×1|3×3.1|3×3.1)
Kissane (1939): . . . |1–5.6–8+10–11.12–16|17–22.23–27 (. . . |3×5|5.5)
Irwin (1946): . . . 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–10.12–14.17–19.20–22.24–26.27
Möller (1955): . . . 1–7.8–26.27 (. . . 7.19.1)
Kroeze (1961): . . . 1–7.8–16.17–27; similarly Weiser (1968), Van Selms (1982), Habel (1985), Hartley (1988)
Skehan (1961): . . . 1–2|3–7.8+10–13.14–16.17–21.22–26|27 (. . . 2|5.5.3.5.5|1); similarly Murphy (1981) and cf. MacKenzie (1990)
Fohrer (1963): . . . 1–5|6–9+11.12–16|17–21.23–27 (. . . 5|5.5|5.5); cf. Ley (1895) and Kissane (1939)
Terrien (1963): . . . ||1–3.4–5.6–7||8–10.11–13.14–16.17|18–20.21–23.24–26.27
Horst (1968): . . . 1–7.8–16.17–21+23–27 (. . . |7|9|5.5)
TOB (1978): . . . |1–5.6–7|8–16.17|18–26.27
KBS (1980): . . . 1–7.8–16.17–26.27; cf. Clines (1989)
De Wilde (1981): . . . |2–3.4–5.6–7|1+8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16|17–18.19–20.21–22.23–24.25–26.27
Webster (1983): 1–5.6–11.12–16.17–21.22–26 (27)
Bezuidenhout (1986): . . . |1–2.3–5.6–7|8–11.12–14.15–16||17–18.19–21.22–23.24–27
Michel (1987): 1.2–3.4–7.8–11.12–14.15–16.17–18.19–21.22–23.24–26.27
Cotter (1992): 1–7.8–16.17–26.27

4.6 Comments and summary

As far as the main parts of ch. 5 are concerned there is a growing unanimity of opinion among scholars. Notably in recent commentaries the poem has been divided into three sections, with breaks between vv. 7 and 8 and between vv. 16 and 17; so Kroeze, Horst, De Wilde, Habel, Bezuidenhout, Clines, Cotter[1] a.o. (see anal. 4.5). One of the most striking features of these cantos are the lines that introduce these major units, vv. 1, 8 and 17. They may be taken as the headings of the cantos ('framing verses'; Habel, p. 118).[2] In these lines Eliphaz three times sounds a warning in the direction of Job. The first line is explicitly formulated as such; see the imperative *qr'* and the second person form *tpnh*. In the first canto the fate of a foolish person is the main theme. The second canto is characterized by the doxology of vv. 9-14. In canto III Eliphaz from v. 19 onwards, once again (cf. v. 1), explicitly addresses Job (see suffix *-k*)—inclusio (see also anal. 4.4.5). Furthermore, it was already observed by Dillmann that the last line (v. 27) had to be taken as an individual unit, a closure of the poem as a whole.[3] According to Cotter it is not coincidental that Eliphaz's final word opposes 'Us' and 'You' (1992, p. 230).

---

[1] 'The sections described by Horst . . . emerge as most typical of the results achieved by scholars working on a great variety of theoretical bases'; Cotter (1992), p. 122. Similarly already Schlottmann, Hitzig, Dillmann, Löhr, Peters, König.

This division is supported by the analysis of the verbal repetitions within ch. 5 (see anal. 4.4.5). The beginning of the cantos is clearly marked. The poet uses in this chapter four different terms to denote 'God', namely *'l*, *'lhym*, *'lwh* and *šdy*. It is striking that we should come across these expressions only in the first lines of cantos II and III (vv. 8 and 17). But also the *qdšym* from v. 1b (first line of canto I) can be connected with these responsions. True, Eliphaz does not point to God here, but formally we could think for instance of the parallelism *'lhym // qdwš yśr'l* in Ps. 71,22 and *'l // qdwšym* in Hos. 12,1; see also *'lwh* ext. // *qdwš* in Job 6,4 and 10.[4] Skehan pointed to the deliberate use of the *'alef* in v. 8, to indicate the beginning of a new strophe.[5] Almost every word in this line starts with the first character of the Hebrew alphabet (excepting the last word, *dbrty*). Skehan, in my opinion, underestimated the significance of this formal device: we are not dealing with the beginning of a mere strophe, but with the beginning of a canto! Such being the case we may suppose that the poet has tried to mark the beginning of the third canto in the same way; see *'šry*, *'nwš*, *'lwh*, and *'l* in v. 17. In this context it is remarkable, that the last line of canto III should open with the last character of the Hebrew alphabet; see *tbw'* in v. 26a (note also *b'tw* at the opposite end of the line—inclusio by alliteration). Cf. also *wThy ldl Tqwh* in the last line of canto II (v. 16).[6] Finally, the beginning of the cantos is clearly marked by the device of the transition markers; see especially anal. 4.3.1.1.

---

[2] According to Hontheim vv. 1 and 8 demarcate the first 'Zwischenstrophe' by inclusio; Hontheim (1904), p. 102.

[3] See also Stickel, Ley, Vetter, Löhr, König, Skehan, Clines and Cotter in anal. 4.5.

[4] See the following section. Cf. also *yhwh // qdwšym* in Prov. 9,10.

[5] Skehan (1971), p. 101; cf. Stevenson (1948), p. 99.

[6] This quasi-acrostic phenomenon may also be observed in Ps. 1—note *'šry* and *t'bd* in vv. 1 and 6 respectively; see Nic. H. Ridderbos, *Die Psalmen* (BZAW 117), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972, p. 88.

The phenomenon of verbal responsio is not restricted to the opening lines(/strophes) of the cantos but encompasses the first canticles of the cantos in their entirety. See especially *pnh* ('to turn'), *mwt* ('to die'), *'ny* ('I'), *nṣl* (hiph'il 'to deliver'), *r'b* ('to be hungry') in anal. 4.4.5.

The final strophe of the poem (v. 27) forms an integral part of its framework as described above: (a) it is a mono-line strophe at the beginning of a new 'incomplete canto'; (b) it joins the pattern of the verbal repetitions (see *hnh*, but also *ḥqr* and *lk* in anal. 4.4.5).

The last lines of the cantos distinguish themselves from the foregoing ones on the basis of their contents and their form. Formally they are marked by the identical beginnings of the lines—anaphora; note *ky* in vv. 6–7, *w-* in vv. 15–16, and *wyd't ky* in vv. 24–25. At the same time, this device mutually connects the last lines of the cantos by verbal repetition; note *ky* and *w-* (anal. 4.4.5)—responsio. From a thematic point of view they may be taken as the summary/conclusion of the cantos concerned. This is most obvious for vv. 24–26. Cotter correctly points out that vv. 18–23 focus on Job as an individual; vv. 24–26, then, describe the 'reintegration of Job into society'.[7] In vv. 6–7 the 'principle of man-produced suffering is finally spelled out in gnomic fashion'.[8] Vv. 15–16 are a working-out of v. 11 (and v. 8).[9] On the basis of the special character of these lines I take them as indiviual canticles.

The lines that precede the final canticles of the cantos fall into strophes. The opening lines of the cantos are admonitions couched in mono-line strophes; see anal. 4.2. As such they are a further marker of the beginning of a higher unit.[10] Each time they are followed by an argument that supports the advice; note *ky* in vv. 2 and 18. Vv. 9–14 divide into two 3-line strophes, which semantically form an antithetic parallelism: God's positive actions (vv. 9–11) are contrasted by the negative ones (vv. 12–14; *parallelismus stropharum*). See also *'śh* in anal. 4.4.3. The 3-line strophes in canticle III.1 are especially marked as such by the repetitive parallelisms described in anal. 4.4.2.

It may be observed now, that the cantos become longer as the poem unwinds: 7, 9 and 10 lines. This lengthening systematically comes about step by step. Firstly the two-line strophes of canticle I.1 are extended by one line. Then, the two-line strophe of I.2 (cf. II.2) is extended by one line

---

[7] Cotter (1992), p. 227.

[8] Clines, 'Job 5,1–8: A New Exegesis', *Biblica* 62 (1981), p. 194. Cf. also Horst, Habel ('two didactic sayings'), and Cotter (1992), p. 203.

[9] Cf. Cotter (1992), p. 219. This critic also points to the 'thematic finality' of v. 16 in the context of vv. 8–16 (p. 219).

[10] See part VI, 1.2.5, final paragraph.

(vv. 24–26).

From a thematic point of view there is an obvious *linear*, external parallelism between the successive cantos of ch. 5; note especially the beginning and the end of the cantos, vv. 1, 8, 17 and vv. 6–7, 15–16, 24–26 resp. In the final strophes of the cantos we arrive at the *main thought* of the poem. In these strophes Eliphaz works up to a climax: man himself is the cause of his own misery (vv. 6–7), God can save from evil (vv. 15–16), He is able to *restore Job's happiness* (vv. 24–26). This positive message sharply contrasts with the main theme of ch. 4 (message of doom; see 3.6 above). From this thematic point of view, then, the first canto of ch. 5 (vv. 1–7) functions as a transition unit between the individual poems.[11] Nevertheless, as pointed out above, these verses are in the first place woven into the structure of vv. 8–27.[12]

I conclude that the macrostructure of ch. 5, as far as length of canticles and cantos is concerned, totally differs from that of the preceding chapter. The attempts by Ley, Kissane and Fohrer (cf. also Horst, Skehan and Webster in anal. 4.5) to demonstrate a series of five-line units in ch. 5 too, completely ignore the special framework of this poem. The first canticle only, dovetails with the canticle-pattern of ch. 4. However, characteristic differences emerge when we take into consideration the verbal repetitions that determine the structures of chs. 4 and 5. In ch. 4 the noun *'lwh* plays a part in the final canticles of the cantos; in ch. 5 expressions for God emerge in the first line of the cantos. In ch. 4 the end of the cantos is especially marked by the root *'bd* and by *mbly.* The words do not occur in ch. 5 at all. Furthermore, Cotter rightly points out that the division between chs. 4 and 5 'should not be pushed too far' (p. 136). It is even possible to note a common responsio at the beginning of the cantos; see the preposition *'l.* Also the root *dbr* appears again in the first line of canto II in ch. 5 (v. 8b); cf. 4,2a and 12a.[13] See in this connection also *h-* interrogative in 5,1 and 4,2, *yd* ('hand') and *ḥzq* ('to be strong') in 5,15 and 4,3, *tqwh* ('hope') in 5,16 and 4,6 (end canticle), *ysr* ('to admonish') in 5,17 and 4,3, *ng'* ('to touch') in 5,19 and 4,5, *tbw'* ('it/you will come') in 5,26 and 4,5 (see also note 11 above).

---

[11] We are especially reminded of 4,7–11; see *r'yty* in 4,8 and 5,3, and *'wn* // *'ml* in 4,8 and 5,6 (see also *'ml* in 5,7).

[12] See about the seven-line canto in the structure of a poem part VI, 1.2.2.

[13] This connection is remarkable because by using *dbrty* the poet breaks apart the quasi-acrostic device of 5,8. Use of the noun *'mrh* would be more natural from this point of view; cf. Clines, ad loc. Such links, however, can also be observed between poems of two successive speakers. See, e.g., *w'ynny* in 7,8.21 and *'ynnw* in 8,22; *'d 'nh* in 18,1 and 19,1.

5 Job’s first reply to Eliphaz (1): Job 6

Structure: 12.10.7 > 6.6|7.3|4.3 > 3.3|3.3||1.3.3|3||1.3|3

I.1	[2] *lw šqwl yšql k‘śy*	*wHWTy bm’znym yś’w yḥd*	
	[3] *ky ‘th mḥwl ymym ykbd*	*‘l kn dbry l‘w*	
	[4] *ky ḥṣy ŠDY ‘mdy*	*’šr ḥmtm šth rwḥy*	*b‘wty ’LWH [y‘rkwny*
	[5] **h**_ynhq pr’ ‘ly dš’_	**’m** *yg‘h šwr ‘l blylw*	
	[6] **hy**_’kl tpl mbly mlḥ_	**’m** *yš ṭ‘m bryr ḥlmwt*	
	[7] *m’nh lngw‘* **npšy**	*hmh kdwy lḥmy*	
I.2	[8] *my ytn tbw’ š’lty*	*wtqwty ytn* **’lwh**	
	[9] *wy’l* **’lwh** *wydk’ny*	*ytr ydw wybṣ‘ny*	
	[10] *wTHY ‘wd nḥmty*	*w’sldh bḥylh l’ yḥmwl*	*ky l’ kḥdty ’mry* **[qdwš**
	[11] *mh KḤY ky ’yḥl*	*wmh qṣy ky ’’ryk* **npšy**	
	[12] *’M KḤ ’bnym KḤY*	*’M bśry nḥwš*	
	[13] *H’M ’yn ‘zrty by*	*wtšyh ndḥh mmny*	
II.1	[14] *lms mr‘hw ḥsd*	**wyr’t** *ŠDY y‘zwb*	
	[15] *’ḥy bgdw kmw nḥl*	*k’pyq nḥlym y‘brw*	
	[16] *hqdrym mny qrḥ*	*‘lymw yt‘lm šlg*	
	[17] *b‘t yzrbw nṣmtw*	*bḥmw nd‘kw mmqwmm*	
	[18] *ylptw ’rḥwt drkm*	*y‘lw bthw wy’bdw*	
	[19] *hbyṭw ’rḥwt tm’*	*hlykt šb’ qww lmw*	
	[20] *bšw ky bṭḥw*	*b’w ‘dyh wyḥprw*	
II.2	[21] *ky ‘TH HYYTM l’KZB*	*tr’w ḥtt* **wtyr’w**	
	[22] *Hky ’mrty hbw ly*	*wmKḤkm šḥdw b‘dy*	
	[23] *wmlṭwny myd ṣr*	*wmyd ‘ryṣym tpdwny*	
III.1	[24] *hwrwny w’ny ’ḥryš*	*wmh šgyty* **hbynw** *ly*	
	[25] *mh nmrṣw ’mry yšr*	*wmh ywkyḥ hwkḥ mkm*	
	[26] *hlhwkḥ mlym tḥšbw*	*wlrwḥ ’mry n’š*	
	[27] *’p ‘l ytwm tpylw*	*wtkrw ‘l ry‘km*	

III.2 [28] *w'TH hw'ylw pnw by*   *w'l pnykm 'M 'KZB*
[29] *šbw n' 'l THY 'wlh*   *wšbw 'wd ṣdqy bh*
[30] *Hyš blšwny 'wlh*   *'M ḤKY l'* **ybyn** *HWWT*

5.1 Text

V. 2b—*whwty*: 'and my misfortune'; so Q. K *whyty*.

V. 7b: meaning uncertain. Clines: 'They are like diseased food to me'.

V. 13a—*h'm*: see BHS.

V. 14a: the meaning of *lms*, and subsequently of the whole colon is difficult to determine. Clines follows the emendation proposed by BHS and translates: 'A friend does not refuse his loyalty'.

V. 20a—*bṭḥw*: MT *bṭḥ*; see GKC § 145u.

V. 21a—*l'kzb*: 'like a deceitful (brook)'; so Ball and Baumgärtel (p. 23) with reference to LXX; cf. Jer. 15,18 and Mic. 1,14. This reading is supported by analysis 5.4.5. Horst's proposal to read *l'l* ('zu Nichtigem'; cf. 24,25) also deserves serious consideration; note *ykzyb // yśm l'l* in 24,25. MT *l'*.

V. 29b—*wšbw*: so Q; K *wšby*.

V. 30b—*hwwt*: according to Habel the inclusio with *hwt* in v. 2 points to the usual meaning 'destruction, misfortune'. The inclusio, however, may also depend on alliteration; therefore, I prefer 'deceit, falsehood' (Gordis, with reference to Mic. 7,3 and Ps. 5,10) or 'words, utterances' (Pope, Michel [with reference to *'mry yšr* in v. 25]). The connotation 'deceit' perfectly fits the macrostructure of the poem (see especially *kzb* in anal. 5.4.5); cf. also Pope: 'Job ... reminds his interlocutors that he still ... can recognize nonsense and falsehood ...; cf. xii 2–3'.

5.2 Content

Job addresses his friends: they do not understand his lament—*they* are deceitful, *he* is righteous.

I Job complains about his hopeless situation.

I.1 He rightly complains about his misfortune.

God himself causes my misfortune, that great is my sorrow (vv. 2–4; *complaint*, introduced by *lw* in v. 2a).

One does not complain in times of prosperity (vv. 5–7; *questions*).

I.2 The only way out Job discerns is death.

I would be glad if God should kill me (v. 8–10; *complaint*, introduced by *my ytn* in v. 8a).

There is no hope of restoration anyhow (vv. 11–13; *questions*).

II Job is bitterly disappointed in his friends (an attitude he *did not* expect from his friends).
  II.1 The friends can be compared with a wadi (*complaint*).
    . . . (v. 14; cf. analysis 5.1).
    My brothers are as unreliable as a wadi (vv. 15–17).
    A man puts his trust in them, but when he really needs them, they let him down (vv. 18–20).
  II.2 You are like that; I am finished with you (vv. 21–23; *questions*).

III Job summons his friends to teach him where he is wrong (an attitude he *does* expect from them).
  III.1 Make me understand where I have erred (v. 24).
    Your replies are hard for a desperate person (vv. 25–27).
  III.2 Listen seriously to my complaints; after all I am righteous (cf. v. 10c) and not lying to you (vv. 28–30).

5.3 Transition markers

5.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

5.3.1.1 *lw*, v. 2a
paronom. inf. constr.: *šqwl yšql*, v. 2a
h- interr., v. 5a; ext. // *h*- interr. in v. 6a
my ytn, v. 8a
mh, v. 11a
mh, v. 11b
'th, v. 21a
imperative: *hwrw*, v. 24a
'ny, v. 24a
ḥrš, v. 24a
mh, v. 24b
imperative: *hbynw*, v. 24b
mh, v. 25a
mh, v. 25b
w- beginning line, v. 28a
'th, v. 28a
imperative: *hw'ylw*, v. 28a
imperative: *pnw*, v. 28a; ext. // imper. *šbw* (2×) in v. 29

5.3.1.2 *tqwh*, v. 8b

5.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

5.3.2.1 *hmh*, v. 7b
'p, v. 27a

5.3.2.2 *w*- beginn. line, v. 10a; ext. // *w*- beginn. line in v. 9a
h- interr., v. 13a
w- beginning line, v. 23a
imperative: *mlṭw*, v. 23a; ext. // imperat. *hbw* and *šḥdw* in v. 22a and b resp.
h- interr., v. 30a

5.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

ʿth, v. 3a
h- interr., v. 22a
ʾmr, v. 22a
h- interr., v. 26a
nʾ, v. 29a
ʾl (prohib.), v. 29a

5.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

5.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

ʾ: *ʾlwh*, vv. 4, 8, 9; *ʾm*, vv. 5, 6, 12, 12, 13, 28, 30; *ʾmr*, vv. 10, 22, 25, 26; *ʾrḥ*, vv. 18, 19
b: *b-*, vv. 2, 6, 10, 13, 17, 17, 18, 28, 29, 30; *byn*, vv. 24, 30
h: *h-* interr., vv. 5, 6, 13, 22, 26, 30; *-h*, vv. 20, 29; *hwh*, vv. 2, 30; *hyh*, vv. 10, 21, 29
w: *-w*, vv. 5, 9, 17
y: *-y*, vv. 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 7, 7, 8, 8, 10, 11 (3×), 12, 12, 13, 13, 15, 22, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 30; *yʾl*, vv. 9, 28; *yd*, vv. 9, 23, 23; *ykḥ*, vv. 25, 25, 26; *yrʾ*, vv. 14, 21; *yš*, vv. 6, 30
k: *k-*, vv. 7, 15, 15; *kzb*, vv. 21*, 28; *kḥ*, vv. 11, 12, 12, 22; *ky*, vv. 3, 4, 10, 11, 11, 20, 21, 22; *-km*, vv. 22, 25, 27, 28
l: *l-*, vv. 7, 14, 19, 22, 24, 26, 26; *lʾ*, vv. 10, 10, 30
m: *-m*, vv. 4, 17, 18; *mh*, vv. 11, 11, 24, 25, 25; *-mw*, vv. 16, 19; *mn*, vv. 3, 13, 14, 17, 22, 23, 23, 25
n: *nḥl*, vv. 15, 15; *-ny*, vv. 4, 9, 9, 13, 23, 23, 24; *npš*, vv. 7, 11; *ntn*, vv. 8, 8
ʿ: *ʿwd*, vv. 10, 29; *ʿwlh*, vv. 29, 30; *ʿl*, vv. 3, 5a (*ʿly*), 5b, 16, 27, 27, 28; *ʿth*, vv. 3, 21, 28
p: *pnh*, vv. 28, 28
q: *qwh*, vv. 8, 19
r: *rwḥ*, vv. 4, 26; *rʿh*, vv. 14, 27
š: *šdy*, vv. 4, 14; *šwb*, vv. 29, 29; *šql*, vv. 2, 2

5.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–4: *ky*, vv. 3a.4a—exactly linear
vv. 5–7: *h-* interr., vv. 5a.6a—exactly linear
ʾm, vv. 5b.6b—exactly linear
blylw/mbly, vv. 5b and 6a resp.—alliteration
mlḥ … ḥlmwt/lḥmy, vv. 6a–b and 7b resp.—alliteration

vv. 8–10: *’lwh*, vv. 8b.9a
vv. 11–13: *’m*, vv. 12a+b.13a
vv. 18–20: *’rḥwt*, vv. 18a.19a!—linear
vv. 21–23: *ky*, vv. 21a.22a
mn, vv. 22b.23a+b
vv. 25–27: *’mry*, vv. 25a.26b
ykḥ, vv. 25b (2×).26a! } chiasm; Ceresko (1975), p. 83
-km, vv. 25b.27b—linear; inclusio
vv. 28–30: *b-*, vv. 28a.29b.30a
’m, vv. 28b.30b—inclusio
‘wlh, vv. 29a.30a!—linear

5.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 2–7 (I.1): *‘l*, vv. 3b.5a (*‘ly*)+5b
vv. 8–13 (I.2): *ky*, vv. 10c.11a+b—concatenatio
vv. 14–20 (II.1): *-mw*, vv. 16b.19b; see also *-mw* in v. 15a
-m, vv. 17b.18a—concatenatio

5.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–13 (canto I): *lw/my ytn*, vv. 1a and 8a resp.—exactly linear
’lwh, vv. 4c.8b+9a!—linear; see also *šdy* in v. 4a and *qdwš* in v. 10c
h- interr., vv. 5a+6a.13a—linear
’m, vv. 5b+6b.12a+b+13a—linear
npšy, vv. 7a.11b!—linear

vv. 14–23 (canto II): *yr’*, vv. 14b.21b!—linear
ky, vv. 20a.21a—concatenatio

vv. 24–30 (canto III): *wmh*, vv. 24b.25b—exactly linear; concatenatio; see also *mh* in v. 25a
byn, vv. 24b.30b!—inclusio (Bezuidenhout, p. 86)
‘l, vv. 27a+b.28b—concatenatio
-km, vv. 27b.28b—concatenatio

5.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–7.14–20.24–27: *‘l*, vv. 3b+5a+b.16b.27a; but cf. also *‘l* in v. 28b
šdy, vv. 4a.14b!—linear; see also *’lwh* in v. 4c
-m, vv. 4b.17b+18a!
rwḥ, vv. 4b.26b!

k-, vv. 7b.15a+b!
r‘h, vv. 14a.27b!

vv. 8–13.21–23.28–30: *y’l*, vv. 9a.28a!
yd, vv. 9b.23a+b!
hyh, vv. 10a.21a.29a!
‘wd, vv. 10a.29b!
l’, vv. 10b+c.30b!
kḥ, vv. 11a+12a (2×).22b!
kḥy/*ḥky*, vv. 11a+12a and 30b resp.—alliter.; but see also *ywkyḥ* in v. 25b
’m, vv. 12a+b+13a.28b+30b
h- interr., vv. 13a.30a—exactly linear; see also v. 22a
‘th, vv. 21a.28a—linear; but cf. also *‘th* in v. 3a
’kzb, vv. 21a*.28b!
-km, vv. 22b.28b

vv. 2.30: *hwh*, vv. 2b.30b!—inclusio (Habel, p. 143)

5.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

5.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

’mr, *b-*, *h-* interr. (v. 26), *-y*, *mh* (v. 11), *mn*, *‘th* (v. 3)

5.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

-h, *-w*, *yš*, *l-*, (*nḥl*), *-ny*, (*ntn*), (*pnh*), *qwh*, (*šwb*), (*šql*)

5.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–17.18–21.22–24.25–27.28–30|... (4×3.2×4.3×3|...)
Stickel (1842): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–17.18–20.21–23.24–27|28–30... (4×3|4.3.3.4|3...)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–4.5–7.8–10||11–13.14–17.18–20||21–23.24–27.28–30||... (3×3||3.4.3||3.4.3||...); cf. Dillmann (1869)
Ewald (1854): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–15*.16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30|...
Merx (1871): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–17.18–21.22–24.25–27.28–30... (7.6.7.6|8.8.3×6)
Hitzig (1874): 2–7.8–13|14–20.21–27|28–29|... (6.6|7.7|2|...)

Delitzsch (1876): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–17.18–20.21–23.24–27.28–30|... (7.6.7.6.8.6.6.8.6|...)

Wright (1883): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–16.17–18.19–20.21–23.24–25.26–27|28–30... (7.6.7.6|6.4.4.6.4.4|6...)

Dillmann (1891): 2–4.5–7.8–10||11–13.14–17.18–20|21–23.24–27.28–30||... (7.6.7||6.8.6|6.8.6||...); cf. Schlottmann (1851)

Bickell (1894): 2–3.4*.5–6.8–9.10*.11–12.13–14.15–16.19+17.22–23.24–25.26–27.28–29.30+7,1...

Ley (1895): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–14.15–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30|... (3×3.2×4.4×3|...)

Duhm (1897): 2–3.4+7a.5–6.8–9.10a–b+11.12–13|15–16.17–18.19–20.22–23.24–25.26–27|28–29.30+7,1...

Vetter (1897): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13|14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23.24–25.26–27.28–30|...

Hontheim (1904): 2–7|8–13||14–17.18–21||22–24|25–27||28–30||... (6.6.|8|3.3|3|...)

Müller (1907), pp. 82–85: 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–20.21–27|28–30 (7.6.7.6|14.14|6); cf. Hitzig (1874)

Schlögl (1916): 2–10.11–20.21–30 (3×20); cf. Schlottmann (1851) and Dillmann (1891)

Löhr (1918): 2–3.4*.5–6.8–9|10*.11–12.13+15.17–18|22–23.24–25.26–27.28–29|... (4×2|4×2|4×2|...)

Ball (1922): 2–3.4*.5–6.8–9.11–12.13–14.15–16.17+19.20+18.21–22a+23b.24–25.26–27.28+30...

Peters (1928): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23.24–25.26–27.28–30|... (4×3|7×2.3|...)

König (1929): 2–7.8–10.11–14.15–20.21–27...

Kissane (1939): 2–7.8–14.15–20|22–23+21+24–27.28–7,3|... (6.7.6|7.6|...)

Irwin (1946): 2–4b.5–7|8–10b.11–13|15–17.18–20|21–23.24–26.28–30|... (3.3|3.3|3.3|3.3.3|...)

Möller (1955): 2–7.8–13.14–20.21–23.24–30|... (6.6.7.3.7|...)

Kroeze (1961): 1–13.14–30...

Skehan (1961): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–14|15–17.18–20.21–23||24–27.28–30||... (3.3.3.4|3.3.3||4.3||...); cf. Epping-Nelis (1968) and MacKenzie (1990)

Fohrer (1963): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|15–17.18–21.22–25.26+28–30|... (4×3|3.3×4|...)

Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13||14.15–17.18–20.21|22–24.25–27.28–30||...

Horst (1968): 2–7.8–13.14–21.22–30||... (3.3|3.3|8|3.3.3|||...)

TOB (1978): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13|14.15–20.21|22–27.28–30|...; cf. Terrien (1963)

KBS (1980): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–20.21.22–30...
Murphy (1981): 2–4|5–6.7|8–10|11–14.15–27||28–30|... (3.3.3.4.3.3.3.4| 3...)
De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4+7,11c.6,5–6.30+7|8–10b.11–13|14*+10c.15–16. 17–18.19–20.21.22–23.24–25.26–27.28–29|...
Van Selms (1982): 2–7.8–13.14–21.22–30...
Webster (1983): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13; 14–17.18–20.21–23.24–27.28–30...
Habel (1985): 2–7.8–13||14.15–20.21|22–26.27||28–30; cf. Van Selms (1982)
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13||14–17.18–21|22–24.25–27. 28–30||... (3.3|3.3||4.4|3×3||...)
Michel (1987): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–17.18–21.22–24.25–27.28–30
Hartley (1988): 2–7.8–13|14–23.24–30||...
Clines (1989), p. 167: 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13||14.15–17.18–20|21–23.24.25–27| 28–30||... (3.3|3.3||1.3.3|3.1.3|3||...); cf., however, p. 176 with regard to vv. 14–30: 14.15–17.18–20.21|22–23.24–26.27–29.30

5.6 Comments and summary

Just like the speech of Eliphaz, Job's answer in chs. 6–7 contains two individual poems. The dividing line between these poems again coincides with the chapter division. In the first poem (ch. 6) Job addresses the friends. The second poem (ch. 7) is addressed to God.[1] The change of the direction of address, however, is not a reliable criterion by which the borderline between successive poems within a speech can be determined.[2] Nevertheless, I will demonstrate that the macrostructure of the individual poems of chs. 6–7 and the formal relationships of these poems with their context sustain the assumption concerned.

The poem of ch. 6 as a whole shows an obvious caesura between vv. 13 and 14. The first part of the poem (vv. 2–13) is thematically marked off from the following verses by Job's *lament* (*appeal*, Clines) about his hopeless situation. This part concentrates on Job himself. His lament is inspired by the incomprehension of the friend(s; cf. chs. 4–5), and we may assume that Job is speaking to the friends here; cf. v. 21.[3]

From v. 14 onwards the friends' behaviour towards Job forms the central theme.[4] However, critics disagree on the framework of vv. 14–30. Scholars like Ewald, Peters, Kroeze, Fohrer, Terrien, Hartley and Clines (a.o.) take vv. 14–30 in all as a relatively independent unit within ch. 6. Critics often assume a main break between vv. 20 and 21.[5] This break seems to be supported by the fact that from v. 21 onwards Job addresses his friends in a straightforward way; see *hyytm* in v. 21a. More recently, critics suppose a main caesura between vv. 21 and 22.[6] Müller (1907) split off vv. 28–30; so recently Habel.[7] Skehan was of the opinion that vv. 24–30 had to be separated from the 'alphabtic' part vv. 2–23. He takes these verses as a transitional strophe between chs. 6 and 7 (1971, p. 102).

---

[1] See for this dichotomy also Köster, Delitzsch, Ley, Schlögl, Möller (see also p. 47), Horst, Habel, Hartley (anal. 5.5).

[2] See the analysis of chs. 12–14 below.

[3] As against Clines who takes this unit as a monologue; cf. 7,1–6 (in this unit Job is speaking to God, although vv. 1–6 do not explicitly state the addressee—so also Clines!).

As for the framework of vv. 14–30, I believe that the analysis of the verbal repetitions provides an objective criterion to make a sound decision. These repetitions also confirm the traditionally accepted caesura between vv. 13 and 14. Next, this analysis supports Skehan's view that vv. 24–30 represent a relatively independent unit, a canto, in the poem of ch. 6 as a whole. Especially important in this context are the responsions which occur in the final strophes of the cantos, vv. 11–13, 21–23 and 28–30; note *hyh* ('to be'), *kḥ* ('strength'), *'m* ('when'), *h-* interr., *'th* ('now') and *'kzb** in anal. 5.4.5. The cluster of these repetitions marks vv. 21–23 as the final strophe of canto II. The beginning of the cantos I and II is especially highlighted by the name of God, *šdy* (anal. 5.4.5). On this level there are no repetitions which exactly mark v. 24 as the beginning of canto III. This canto, however, is demarcated by a fine inclusio; see the root *byn* hiph'il ('to understand') in vv. 24b and 30b, in both cases the penultimate word of the line (anal. 5.4.4). The opening line of canto III also displays a whole cluster of transition markers; see anal. 5.3.1.1.

From v. 24 onwards there is a prominent shift in the development of the contents, too. 'In a *dramatic change of mood* Job seeks for sympathetic guidance from his friends'.[8] From a thematic point of view, then, the second and the third cantos form an antithetic parallelism: canto II describes the behaviour Job *did not* expect from his 'brothers' (v. 15), canto III expresses Job's *positive* hope. In the third canto Job summons his friends to sympathetic refutation[9] and a patient hearing. According to Skehan vv. 24–27 are retrospective, and vv. 28–30 are preparatory to the discourse of ch. 7.[10] Vv. 14–23 are characterized by the metaphor about the friends as a wadi; note also the keyword *yr'* in vv. 14b and 21b (anal. 5.4.4).

---

[4] Although the correct translation of v. 14a is obscure (cf. anal. 5.1), it is clear that Job in this verse reproaches the friends for lacking in 'loyalty' (*ḥsd*); Clines.

[5] So Schlottmann, Dillmann, Schlögl, König, Kissane, Irwin, Van Selms.

[6] Terrien, Horst, TOB, Van Selms; and cf. Habel.

[7] Cf. Stickel, Hitzig, Wright, Duhm, Hontheim.

[8] Hartley (italics mine, PvdL). 'Job leaves off his bitter bantering' (Clines).

[9] Cf. Möller (p. 41) and Hartley.

Scholars who advocate a strophic structure for ch. 6 in its narrow sense generally agree that the poem predominantly displays strophes of three masoretic verses (see anal. 5.5). Clines correctly notes in this context that vv. 14 and 24 stand independent within this regular structure. For v. 14 as a mono-line strophe see also Terrien, TOB and Habel. These mono-line strophes further support my canto division, because they exactly occur at the beginning of my second and third canto.[11] The strophes of canto I display a very regular, linear pattern. Both in form and content the first strophe corresponds to the third one, and the second strophe corresponds to the fourth one; see anal. 5.2 and 5.4.4 (cf. also Bezuidenhout, p. 82). The first and the third strophe describe what *God* does (not) to Job; the second and the fourth strophe describe how *Job* deals with God's actions. Habel correctly notes that the final cola of the first and the third strophes (vv. 4c and 10c) 'bring to focus the major contentions of Job' in the first canto.[12]

The three-line strophes of the second canto are especially determined by their contents (anal. 5.2). The repetition of the root *yr'* in vv. 14 and 21 does not point to an inclusio (so Habel; and cf. Clines, p. 176), but constitutes a responsio on the level of the canticles (anal. 5.4.4).[13]

It may be observed now, that the cantos of this poem—different from those in ch. 5—become gradually shorter: 12.10.7. This shortening again comes about systematically step by step. It's true, the first canticle of canto II is extended by one line (3.3 > 1.3.3; see v. 14), but the second canticle is halved (3.3 > 3). Then, the first canticle of canto III is shortened by a three-line strophe too (1.3.3 > 1.3; see vv. 24–27).

From a thematic point of view we can establish a linear, external parallelism in the poem as a whole. The second canticles within the cantos (I.2, II.2, III.2) are connected by the theme of reliability. Here, I think, we are on to the *main thought* of the poem. The friends are designated as unreliable (note v. 21a), against their unreliability Job stresses his *innocence* (note vv. 10c and 29b) and his honesty (note v. 28b).

---

[10] So also Epping-Nelis. Cf. also the opinion of Müller (1907), mentioned above.

[11] See part VI, 1.2.5.

[12] There are no indications, I believe, that the canticles of this first canto, vv. 2–7 and 8–13, show a concentric structure each; as against Habel, p. 142.

[13] According to Habel vv. 14, 21 and 27 are the 'lead verses' that frame the unit vv. 14–27. In this context Habel also points to the repetition of *r'h* in vv. 14 and 27 (p. 143). Habel's analysis, however, does not take into account the verbal repetitions that frame the poem as a whole. Within this framework the noun *r'h* functions as a (linear) responsio (anal. 5.4.5).

6 Job’s first reply to Eliphaz (2): Job 7

Structure: 8.8.7 > 4.4|4.4|3.4 > 2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.1|2.2

I.1	[1] *hl’ ṣb’ l’NWŠ ‘ly ’rṣ*	*wkymy śkyr ymyW*	
	[2] *k‘bd yš’p ṣl*	*wkśkyr* **yqwh** *p‘lW*	
	[3] *kn hnḥlty ly yrḥy šw’*	*wlylwt ‘ml mnw ly*	
	[4] *’m škbty w’mrty*	*mty ’QWM wmdd ‘rb*	*wśb‘ty nddym* [*‘dy nšp*
I.2	[5] *lbš bśry rmh wgwš ‘PR*	*‘wry rg‘ wYM’S*	
	[6] *ymy qlw mny ’rg*	*wyklw b’ps* **tqwh**	
	[7] *zkr ky rwḥ ḤYY*	*l’ tšwb ‘yny lr’wt ṭwb*	
	[8] *l’ tšwrny ‘yn r’y*	*‘ynyk by W’YNNY*	

II.1	[9] *klh ‘nn wylk*	*kn ywrd š’wl l’ y‘lh*	
	[10] *l’ yšwb ‘wd lbytW*	*wl’ ykyrNW ‘wd MQMW*	
	[11] *gm ’ny l’ ’ḥśk py*	*’dbrh bṣr rwḥy*	*’śyḥh bmr* **npšy**
	[12] *hym ’ny ’m tnyn*	*ky tśym ‘ly mšmr*	
II.2	[13] *ky ’mrty tnḥmny ‘rśy*	*YŚ’ bśyḥy mškby*	
	[14] *wḥttny bḥlmwt*	*wmḥzynwt tb‘tny*	
	[15] *wtbḥr mḥnq* **npšy**	*mwt m‘ṣmwty*	
	[16] *M’STY l’ l‘lm ’ḤYH*	*ḥdl mmny ky hbl ymy*	

III.1	[17] **mh** *’NWŠ ky tgdlNW*	*wky tšyt ’lyW lbk*
	[18] *wtpqdNW lbqrym*	*lrg‘ym tbḥnNW*
	[19] *kmh l’ tš‘h mmny*	*l’ trpny ‘d bl‘y rqy*
III.2	[20] *ḥṭ’ty* **mh** *’p‘l lk*	*nṣr h’dm*
	lmh śmtny lmpg‘ lk	*w’hyh ‘lyk lMŚ’*
	[21] *wmh l’ TŚ’ pš‘y*	*wt‘byr ’t ‘wny*
	ky ‘th l‘PR ’škb	*wšḥrtny W’YNNY*

6.1 Text

V. 1a—*‘ly*: so Q; cf. 8,9 20,4 38,24. K *‘l*.

V. 3a—*hnḥlty ly*: in this construction the preposition *l-* is emphatic (‘I am allotted, yea I’); see C.F. Whitley, *JQR* 65 (1974–75), pp. 225–28 (note p. 226).

V. 4: in accordance with the accents of MT I take this verse as a tricolon (cf. part VI, 2.1; so also Rozelaar). Most critics consider this accentuation to be impossible and put a major caesura between *’qwm* and *wmdd*. In this context the verse is sometimes extended to a tetracolon (Duhm, Horst, Clines; with reference to LXX). However, MT makes good sense. When we take God as the subject of *mdd* the root can retain its usual meaning in pi‘el: ‘abmessen’ (HAL; 2 Sam. 8,2 Pss. 60,8 108,8). Following the ‘Statenvertaling’ (1637) I translate v. 4b: ‘Wanneer zal ik opstaan, en Hij den avond afgemeten hebben?’ (‘When shall I arise, and will He have measured the evening?’; cf. Tur-Sinai).

V. 5a—*wgwš*: ‘crust’; so Q. K *wgyš*.

V. 15b—*mwt m‘ṣmwty*: ‘death rather than my bones(/existence)’. According to Gordis *‘ṣm* in the plural represents the entire person in wisdom literature (cf. Prov. 3,8 14,30 15,30 16,24); so also Clines (cf. Van Selms). Sarna takes the first character of *m‘ṣmwty* as an enclitic *-m*: ‘my bones death’; see N.M. Sarna, *JSS* 6 (1955), pp. 108–10 (109)—so also Michel, Habel, Hartley (cf. M.H. Pope, *Maarav* 7 [1991], pp. 199–206).

V. 20a—*lk*: note the pausal form. According to Revell this form points to the end of a colon; see E.J. Revell *VT* 31 (1981), p. 199. V. 20, like v. 21, represents two bicola; so also Hontheim (p. 304) and Clines (p. 157); cf. further, Dhorme, Horst, De Wilde and Habel (four cola). Note the similar masoretic accentuation of vv. 20 and 21.

V. 20d—*‘lyk*: cf. LXX; MT *‘ly* (one of the about 20 *tiqqunê sopherîm*).

V. 21: as is generally agreed, this masoretic verse represents two bicola (see the layout in BHS; cf. 11,6).

6.2 Content

Job addresses himself with his lament to God: I am close to death.

I ‘Remember, my life is but wind’.

  I.1 His life can be compared with that of a hireling.
    Life of *mankind in general* can be compared with the hard service of a slave (vv. 1–2).
    That goes for my own life too (vv. 3–4).

  I.2 He is in danger of losing his life.
    My physical situation is so hopeless that the end is nigh (vv. 5–6).
    Look my hopeless situation straight in the eye!: my *death*

is in sight (vv. 7–8; *appeal to God*).
II ‘Leave me alone’.
II.1 Because death is the defintive end for a human being, Job protests.
Mankind in general comes up no more from the underworld (vv. 9–10).
I do no longer accept this oppression from You (vv. 11–12).
II.2 Because he is not granted any rest, Job wants to die.
At night You do not leave me alone either (vv. 13–14).
I prefer immediate *death*; leave me alone! (vv. 15–16; *appeal to God*)
III ‘Why do You not pardon my sin’.
III.1 He wonders why God is interested in people.
Why do You take so much trouble to put *mankind in general* to the test? (vv. 17–18).
Why do You focus so much attention on me (v. 19).
III.2 He wonders why God does not turn a blind eye to his sins.
My possible sins cannot be the reason why You make me Your target, can they? (v. 20).
Disregard my sins!; for soon I will be *dead* (v. 21; *appeal to God*).

6.3 Transition markers

6.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

6.3.1.1 *h-* interr., v. 1a
’nwš, v. 1a
emphatic *l-*, v. 3a
imperative: *zkr*, v. 7a
’ny, v. 11a; ext. // *’ny* in v. 12a
cohortative: *’dbrh*, v. 11b
cohortative: *’śyḥh*, v. 11c
w- beginning line, v. 15a
mh, v. 17a
’nwš, v. 17a
kmh, v. 19a
mh, v. 20a; ext. // *lmh* in v. 20c
vocative: *nṣr h’dm*, v. 20b
w- beginning line, v. 21a
mh, v. 21a

6.3.1.2 *’mr*, v. 13a

6.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

6.3.2.1 *’mr*, v. 4a
tqwh, v. 6b
‘lm, v. 16a

6.3.2.2 *mty*, v. 4b† (see Psalms)
h- interr., v. 12a
imperative: *ḥdl*, v. 16b

‘th, v. 21c

6.3.3 Contrary indications

gm, v. 11a
w- beginning line, v. 14a
w- beginning line, v. 18a

6.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

6.4.1 General survey

’: *’yn*, vv. 8, 21; *’m*, vv. 4, 12; *’mr*, vv. 4, 13; *’nwš*, vv. 1, 17; *’ny*, vv. 11, 12
b: *b-*, vv. 6, 8, 11, 11, 13, 14
h: *h-* interr., vv. 1, 12
w: *-w*, vv. 1, 2, 10, 10, 17
ḥ: *ḥyh*, vv. 7, 16
y: *-y*, vv. 3, 3, 5, 5, 6, 7, 7, 8, 8, 11 (3×), 12, 13 (3×), 15, 15, 16, 19, 19, 21, 21; *ywm*, vv. 1, 1, 6, 16
k: *k-*, vv. 1, 2, 2, 19; *-k*, vv. 8, 17, 20 (3×*); *ky*, vv. 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 17, 21; *klh*, vv. 6, 9; *kn*, vv. 3, 9
l: *l-*, vv. 1, 3, 3, 7, 10, 16, 18, 18, 20 (5×), 21; *l’*, vv. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 10, 11, 16, 19, 19, 21
m: *m’s*, vv. 5, 16; *mh*, vv. 17, 19, 20, 20, 21; *mn*, vv. 6 (*mny*), 14, 15, 16, 19
n: *-nw* (3 masc. sing.), vv. 10, 17, 18, 18; *-ny*, vv. 8, 8, 13, 14, 14, 16, 19, 19, 20, 21, 21; *nś’*, vv. 13, 20, 21; *npš*, vv. 11, 15
‘: *‘d/‘dy*, vv. 4, 19; *‘wd*, vv. 10, 10; *‘yn*, vv. 7, 8, 8; *‘l/‘ly*, vv. 1, 20; *‘pr*, vv. 5, 21
p: *p‘l*, vv. 2, 20
q: *qwh*, vv. 2, 6; *qwm*, vv. 4, 10
r: *r’h*, vv. 7, 8; *rg‘*, vv. 5, 18; *rwḥ*, vv. 7, 11
ś: *śyḥ*, vv. 11, 13; *śym*, vv. 12, 20; *śkyr*, vv. 1, 2
š: *šwb*, vv. 7, 10; *škb*, vv. 4, 13, 21

6.4.2 Within the strophes

vv. 1–2: *k-*, vv. 1b.2a+b
śkyr, vv. 1b.2b!

-w, vv. 1b.2b—exactly linear; note also *w-* beginning colon in vv. 1b and 2b—exactly linear
vv. 7–8: *l’ tšwb ‘yny lr’wt*/*l’ tšwrny ‘yn r’y*, vv. 7b and 8a resp.; note *r’h*!, and see also *‘yn* in v. 8b!
vv. 11–12: *’ny*, vv. 11a.12a!—linear
’śyḥh bmr npšy/*ky tśym ‘ly mšmr*, vv. 11c and 12b resp. —alliteration
vv. 13–14: *b-*, vv. 13b.14a
vv. 17–18: *-nw*, vv. 17a.18a+b
v. 20: *’p‘l*/*lmpg‘*, vv. 20a and c resp.—alliteration
lk, vv. 20a.c!—linear

6.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 5–8 (I.2): *b-*, vv. 6b.8b—linear
vv. 13–16 (II.2): *ky*, vv. 13a.16b—inclusio
-y/*-ny*, vv. 13b.14b.15b.16b—rhyme
mn, vv. 14b.15b+16b
vv. 20–21 (III.2): *’dm*/*‘pr*, vv. 20b and 21c resp.—inclusio; cf. *‘pr* // *’dmh* in Job 5,6 and Ps. 104,29–30
nś’, vv. 20d.21a—concatenatio

6.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–8 (canto I): *’rṣ*/*‘pr*, vv. 1a and 5a resp.—exactly linear
ymy, vv. 1b (2×).6a
qwh, vv. 2b.6b!—linear

vv. 9–16 (canto II): *-y*, vv. 11a+b+c.13a+b+15a+b
rwḥ/*hbl*, vv. 11b and 16b resp.; cf. Isa. 57,13
śyḥ, vv. 11c.13b!
npš, vv. 11c.15a!—linear
ky, vv. 12b.13a—concatenatio

vv. 17–21 (canto III): *mh*, vv. 17a+19a.20a+c+21a!
ky, vv. 17a+b.21c—inclusio
-k, vv. 17b.20a+c+d*—linear
kmh l’ tš‘h mmny/*wmh l’ tś’ pš‘y*, vv. 19a and 21a respectively—linear

6.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 1–4.9–12.17–19: *h-* interr., vv. 1a.12a!

’nwš, vv. 1a.17a!—linear (Bezuidenhout, p. 90)
k-, vv. 1b+2a+b.19a!
-w, vv. 1b+2b.10a+b.17b!—linear
kn, vv. 3a.9b!
’m, vv. 4a.12a!—linear
qwm, vv. 4b.10b!
‘dy/‘d, vv. 4c.19b!—linear
nšp/npšy, vv. 4c and 11c resp. (alliter.)
—linear (!; Fokkelman)
-nw, vv. 10b.17a+18a+b!—linear

vv. 5–8.13–16.20–21: *‘pr*, vv. 5a.21c!
m’s, vv. 5b.16a!
ywm, vv. 6a.16b
ḥyh, vv. 7a.16a!—linear
ky rwḥ ḥyy/ky hbl ymy, vv. 7a and 16b resp.
—linear; cf. *rwḥ // hbl* in Isa. 57,13
w’ynny, vv. 8b.21d!—exactly linear (Habel, Bezuidenhout)
nś’, vv. 13b.20d+21a!
škb, vv. 13b.21c

vv. 1–4.20–21, ‘inclusio’: *‘ly/‘l*, vv. 1a.20d!
w- ext. // *w-* beginn. colon, vv. 1b+2b.21b+d
p‘l, vv. 2b.20a!
škb, vv. 4a.21c

vv. 7–8.9–10: *šwb*, vv. 7b.10a!—concat. (Bezuidenhout)
vv. 15–16.17–18: *ky*, vv. 16b.17a+b—concatenatio

6.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

6.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

b- (v. 11), *-y*, *-k* (v. 8), *l’*, *mn*, *-ny*

6.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

’mr, *klh*, *l-*, (*‘wd*), *rg‘*, *śym*

6.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...|1–3.4–6.7–10.11.12.13–15.16–18.19–21 (...|3.3.4.1.1. 3×3); cf. Epping-Nelis (1968)

Stickel (1842): ...1–3.4–6|7–11.12–16.17–21 (...3.3|3×5); cf. Dillmann (1869)
Schlottmann (1851): ...||1–3.4–6.7–10||11–12.13–14.15–16|17–18.19.20–21 (...||3.3.4||2.2.2|2.1.2)
Ewald (1854): ...|1–5.6–10.11.12–16.17–21
Merx (1871): ...1–4.5–8|9–11.12–15.16–19.20–21 (...8.8|7.8.8.7)
Hitzig (1874): ...|1–5.6–10|11|12–16.17–21 (...|5.5|1|5.5)
Delitzsch (1876): ...|1–3.4–6.7–11.12–16.17–19.20–21 (...|6.6.11.10.6.8)
Wright (1883): ...1–3.4.5–7.8–10|11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21 (...6.3.6.6|5.4.4.4.5.4)
Dillmann (1891): ...||1–3.4–6.7–10.11|12–15.16–19.20–21 (...||6.7.8.3| 8.8.7)
Ley (1895): ...|1–4.5–8.9–11.12–15.16–19.20–21 (...|4.4.3.4.4.4)
Duhm (1897): ...6,30–7,1.2–3.4*.5–6.7–8.9–10|11–12*.13–14.15–16.17–18. 19–20*.21
Vetter (1897): ...|1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16|17–18.19–20.21
Hontheim (1904): ...||1–5.6–7+21c–d+8–10|11–16.17–21b (...|12.12; ...||a.b|a'.b')
Schlögl (1916): 1–11.12–21 (22.22)
Löhr (1918): ...|6,30–7,1.2–3.4–5.6–7|9–10.11a–b+12.13–14.15–16|17–18. 19+20c–d.20a–b*.21 (...|4×2|4×2|4×2); cf. Bickell (1894)
Ball (1922): ...11*.12–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20.21.1–2.3–4b.4c–5*.6–7. 9–10
Peters (1928): ...|1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10|11–12.13–15.16–17.18–19.20.21 (...|5×2|2.3.4×2)
Kissane (1939): ...6,28–7,3|4–10.11–16.17–21 (...6|7.6.7)
Irwin (1946): ...|1–2.3–4.5–6|7–8.9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16.17–18|... (...|2.2.2|2.2.2|2.2.2)
Möller (1955), p. 47: ...|1–5.6–10.11.12–16.17–21 (...|5.5.1.5.5, or ...|5.5.6.6, or ...|5.6.5.6, or ...|6.5.5.6); cf. Ewald (1854) and Hitzig (1874)
Kroeze (1961): ...1–10.11–21; cf. Van Selms (1982)
Skehan (1961): ...||1–3.4–6.7–10|11–12+20c–d.13–15.16–18.19–20b+21 (...||3.3.4|3.3.3.4); similarly MacKenzie (1990); cf. Murphy (1981)
Fohrer (1963): ...|1–4.5–8.9–11|12–15.16–19.20–21 (...|4.4.4|4.4.3); cf. Ley (1895)
Terrien (1963): ...||1–3.4–5.6–8|9–10.11–12.13–15|16–18.19–20b.20c–21 (...||3.2.3|2.2.3|3.2.3)
Horst (1968): ...|||1–3.4–5*|6–8.9–11||12–15.16–19.20–21 (...|||3.3|3.3|| 4.4.4)
TOB (1978): ...|1–5.6–8|9–11.12–15|16–18.19–21; cf. Terrien (1963)

KBS (1980): ...1–10.11.12–21b.21c–d
De Wilde (1981): ...|1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.
19+20c–d.20a–b+21
Webster (1983): ...1–3.4–6.7–10.11–15.16–19.20–21
Habel (1985): 1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16|17–18.19.20a–b.
20c–d.21
Bezuidenhout (1986): ...||1–3.4–5.6–8|9–11.12–14.15–16|17–19.20–21
(...||3×3|3.3.2|3.3)
Michel (1987): 1–3.4–6.7–8.9–10.11-12.13–16.17–18.19–21
Hartley (1988): ...||1–6.7–10.11–16.17–21
Clines (1989): ...||1–3.4–5|6–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16|17–19.20–21
(...||3.3|3.4×2|3.3)

6.6 Comments and summary

As to the structure of ch. 7, I note that most modern scholars discern two main parts, vv. 1–10 and 11–21. Schlottmann already distinguished two strophes in this lament: 'Er (Hiob) klagt über das traurige Loos des Menschen überhaupt und über seines insbesondere' (vv. 1–10); and 'Er wendet sich mit der Frage an Gott selbst, warum er ihn so schwer strafe, warum er, wenn er gesündigt habe, ihm nicht vergebe' (vv. 11–21).[1] Some critics, though, put the caesura between the two main parts after v. 11; so Fohrer and Horst.[2] Since Ewald, a middle position has been taken up by those scholars who interpret v. 11 as a more or less independent strophe.[3] Especially this middle position is obviously connected with a particular conception of the strophic structure of ch. 7. When we take v. 11 as a 'Mittelvers', then, the sum total of the masoretic verses preceding and following v. 11 is exactly the same. With Hitzig and Möller this results in the symmetric, strophic scheme 5.5.1.5.5 (cf. also Ewald).

Starting from the dichotomy vv. 1–10, 11–21 Van Selms notes that the poem is built up very systematically. In v. 1 he finds two motifs: 'life is hard, and it is short'.[4] These two motifs, then, are respectively elaborated in vv. 2–5 and 6–10 and, once more, in vv. 12–15 and 16–19, according to Van Selms. In v. 21c–d the poet is supposed to return to the thought of v. 1b (life is short) to close the 'circle' around his composition. According to Hontheim (pp. 112–13) 'die beiden großen Schlußstrophen' (vv. 1–10 and 11–21b) of Job's reply to Eliphaz form a strikingly beautiful 'Gedankenresponsion'; see anal. 6.5.

---

[1] So Wright, Duhm, Hontheim, Peters, Kroeze, Skehan (1971, p. 103 n. 16a), Van Selms (see anal. 6.5); and cf. Clines.

[2] The difference between the two parts, according to Horst, is that in vv. 1–11 'Hiob sein persönliches Geschick hineinstellt in eine Elegie über die Mühsal des menschlichen Lebens und dessen Flüchtigkeit und Endlichkeit'; in the second part (vv. 12–21) Job is supposed to make clear, 'was es bedeutet, Gott zum Feinde zu haben und unter seiner ständigen Überwachung leben zu müssen'. So already Dillmann and Schlögl.

[3] See Hitzig, Möller and KBS.

[4] 'Het leven is zwaar, en het is kort'.

These more traditional approaches to the total structure of ch. 7 do, in my opinion, no justice to the logical structure the poet wove into his composition; nor do these approaches reckon with the obvious, verbal repetitions by which the poet underlined his train of thought. My objection to the description of the contents by Schlottmann (and Horst; see above), is that in the second unit of this poem too, Job does not only speak of his own fate, but in vv. 17–18 also of that of mankind in general. This is no basis for a clear distinction between the two supposed units. As regards Van Selms's view, it may be noted that v. 1b does not deal with a *short* life, but rather with *long* days (cf. v. 2a). Furthermore, in vv. 16–19 we only find the motif of the brevity of life in v. 16.

We come much closer to the intention of the poet, when we divide the chapter *with Habel and Bezuidenhout* into three almost identical cantos, vv. 1–8, 9–16 and 17–21.[5] Starting from this division it can be demonstrated that from a thematic as well as from a formal point of view there is a linear parallelism between the beginning and the end of the cantos (see again Habel and Bezuidenhout!). Dillmann (1869) already observed in relation to v. 21c–d: 'Die Begründung ... mit seinem baldigen ... Ende, nach welchem Gott ihn vergeblich suchen wird, um ihn noch eine Gnade zu erweisen, ist wie V.16 und noch mehr wie V.7a.8b'. Cf. also Dhorme about v. 21: 'A la fin, *w'ynny* comme au v.8'. But as far as I could find out only Terrien, Habel and Bezuidenhout connect the repetition of *w'ynny* ('and I shall be gone') in vv. 8b and 21d with their interpretation of the total structure of this poem. 'La première (v. 1–8) et la troisième (v. 16–21) (strophe) se terminent chacune par la phrase: mais je ne serai que néant!' (Terrien).[6] Here we have to do with a clear responsio at the end of the last line of canto I and canto III. In the final strophes of cantos I and II we also come across the root *ḥyh* ('to live', vv. 7a and 16a), another responsio. Compare in this context also *ky rwḥ ḥyy* ('that my life is like the wind', v. 7a) with *ky hbl ymy* ('for my days are but a breath, v. 16b). See for these responsions anal. 6.4.5. From a thematic point of view the final strophes of the cantos also correspond with each other, because they contain an appeal to God; see anal. 6.2.[7]

---

[5] 'This section is a discrete balanced poem', Habel, p. 153.

[6] However, the second canto, according to Terrien, concludes with v. 15 (so also TOB).

[7] Cf. Habel's 'taunt'.

The beginning of each of the three cantos is marked by a strophe in which Job describes the miserable fate of mankind in general (vv. 1–2, 9–10 and 17–18; see anal. 6.2). Next, there is a turning-point in the thought content of each canto. After the opening strophes Job explicitly speaks of his own fate alone; note 'so I am allotted, yea I' (v. 3), 'I also will not refrain my mouth ' (v. 11), and 'how long wilt thou not look away from me?' (v. 19). It is in accordance with this observation that the suffix of the third person singular *-w/-nw* only occurs in the first strophes of the cantos (see anal. 6.4.5). Next, in the first cola of cantos I and III the poet explicitly uses the word *'nwš* to denote mankind in general; another responsio (anal. 6.4.5).[8] Anal. 6.4.5 makes clear that the external parallelism between the cantos is not restricted to the beginning and the end of these units alone. The demarcation of canto III is especially supported by earlier strophic investigations: Stickel, Schlottmann, Ewald, Dillmann (1869), Hitzig, Vetter.[9]

Now that we have established the boundaries of the cantos, it must further be observed that these cantos are thematically connected with each other ('enjambement'). The final strophe of canto I and the first strophe of canto II both deal with the transcience of human life.[10] The questions of the first strophe of canto III, why God takes so much trouble to test his people (vv. 17–18), tie in with the appeal of v. 16b to leave Job alone (see also anal. 6.4.5).

Starting from this total structure of ch. 7, it is also possible to establish with some certainty the pattern of the canticles and the strophes. Analysis 6.5 shows, that former critics tried to demonstrate here regular strophic patterns with strophes from two to five lines! Some critics find in this poem predominantly strophes of three lines—a continuation of the strophic pattern of ch. 6; so already Köster, recently also Skehan, Terrien, Horst, Bezuidenhout, Clines.[11] Since Bickell scholars also combine four cola (or two lines) into a strophe; see Duhm, Vetter, Peters, Irwin, De Wilde, Habel (a.o.) in anal. 6.5. Merx predominantly found strophes of eight cola; his strophic interpretation almost exactly corresponds to that of Ley and Fohrer. Since Stickel there have also been critics who assume strophes of five lines in this chapter; so Ewald, Dillmann (1869), Hitzig and Möller (cf. above). According to Kissane we are dealing here with strophes of no less than six and seven lines.

---

[8] This noun does not occur in vv. 9–10, but is implied; cf. vv. 7–10 with Ps. 103,15–16 (note *'nwš* in v. 15a). There is an obvious relationship between Job 7 and the language and form of the Psalms. In Ps. 39, too, the personal lament is embedded in a lament about human existence in general; cf. C. Westermann, *Der Aufbau des Buches Hiob* (Calwer Theologische Monographien 6), Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 3rd edn 1978, p. 57. Cf. furthermore v. 17 with Pss. 8,5 and 144,3; see T.N.D. Mettinger, 'Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages', in H.A. McKay and D.J.A. Clines (eds.), *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages. Essays in Honour of R.N. Whybray* (JSOTS 162), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993, pp. 266–69.

[9] Recently also in Kissane, Möller, Hartley ('A Plea for a Reprieve') and Clines (anal. 6.5). See further Westermann, *op. cit.*, p. 73: 'fast nur Fragen'.

[10] I already pointed to the obvious allusion between these strophes and Ps. 103,15–16; see also *rwḥ* (v. 7 and Ps. 103,16), *w'ynny/w'ynnw* (v. 8 and Ps. 103,16), and *wl' ykyrnw 'wd mqmw* (v. 10b and Ps. 103,16b). Ps. 103,15–16 is a two-line strophe at the beginning of a canticle (see STR, pp. 374–78). I establish that the poet of the book of Job creatively handles the traditional materials, by expanding a two-line strophe, splitting it up and spreading it over two cantos.

The poem exhibits a very regular framework indeed: two successive lines regularly form a strophe; next, two strophes form a canticle; and finally, two canticles form a canto. Within canto I there is a close connection between the first four lines. Delitzsch rightly noted that 'die Vergleichung v. 2 und das Verglichene v. 3 sich nicht decken'. V. 3 is certainly not a logic continuation of v. 2: as a hireling eagerly looks forward to the end of the day, so am I allotted months of trouble too. The third line rather ties in with v. 1: the days of mankind are like those of a 'slave' (v. 1), so are my 'days' (months and nights; v. 3). Next, v. 4 perfectly ties in with the second line: as a hireling eagerly looks forward to the end of the *day* (v. 2), so am I eagerly looking forward to the end of the *night* (v. 4). On this basis I take the first lines of canto I as two-line strophes that form a semantic *parallelismus stropharum.* The thought of the second canticle of canto I focuses on Job's physical situation. See for the demarcation of the canticles also *'rṣ/ 'pr* and *qwh* in anal. 6.4.4. The first and the third strophe of canto II formulate the basis for Job's 'actions/decisions', as described in the second and the fourth strophe of that canto (cf. anal. 6.2; parallelism of canticles II.1 and II.2!). On the basis of this parallelism I again establish that we are dealing with two-line strophes (cf. also Clines). See for the demarcation of the canticles also *npšy* ('my soul') in anal. 6.4.4. The two first strophes of canto III focus on God's attention for his creatures, mankind in general (vv. 17–18) and Job especially (v. 19)—canticle III.1. Although *nṣr h'dm* in v. 20b seems to join this theme, it is nevertheless justified to connect both final strophes of canto three into a higher unit, canticle III.2. In v. 20a we meet with a totally new idea, namely that of Job's possible sins. This idea recurs in the first line of v. 21. The final line of this strophe (and of the poem as a whole) more especially links up with v. 20c–d: Job is to die (v. 21c–d) because he is God's target (v. 20c–d)—'*parallelismus stropharum*' (cf. vv. 1–4 above).

---

[11] Vv. 20–21 also form a three-line strophe, according to Clines, because v. 20 represents two bicola. In his translation, however, v. 21 is built up of two bicola, too.

As stated above, each canto opens with a description of the human condition in general. From a thematic point of view it is obvious that this description each time takes up two poetic lines. See for vv. 1–2 also anal. 6.4.2. There is only one exception to the regularity of the two-line strophes: the second strophe of canto III (v. 19) is a mono-line strophe. Because such irregularities occur time and again, I conclude that we are dealing with an original feature of Hebrew poetry (see part VI, 1.2.1 and 1.2.5). See for vv. 7, 11, 15 as the beginning of a new strophe also anal. 6.3.1; and for vv. 7–8 and 11–12 as two-line strophes also anal. 6.4.2.

The canticles partially coincide with the 'four-line' strophes of Merx, Ley and Fohrer (cf. also Horst). Thus, the confusion among critics as to the strophic structure of ch. 7 is less bewildering than it seems at first sight. The view of Bickell c.s. (strophes of four cola) and that of Merx c.s. (strophes of eight cola) do not exclude each other. Bickell points to the smallest units, which transcend the line, whereas Merx focusses on the subsequent higher units.

The *quintessential thought* in the poem is again to be found at the end, in the last strophes, of the cantos: Job's recurring appeal to God. Gradually, this appeal becomes more intense. First, Job reminds God of the fact that his life is a mere wind (vv. 7–8); next, he begs God to leave him alone (vv. 15–16); and finally, he implores God *to let pass his possible sins* (v. 21). The final plea of this poem matches Job's statement towards his friends about his integrity in ch. 6 (see 5.6 above).

A comparison of the macrostructures of chs. 6 and 7 confirms my starting-point that we are dealing with two individual poems. From a structural point of view there is not much similarity between the two parts of this speech. The responsions are totally different. This is remarkable, the more so as I found a correspondence in this respect between chs. 6 and 5 (to wit, *'lwh* and *šdy* at the beginning of the cantos).[12] Moreover, there is a correspondence in this respect between chs. 7 and 8; note *'ynnw* ('it will be no more') as the final expression of ch. 8, and the function of *w'ynny* at the end of cantos I and III in ch. 7. The seven-line cantos at the end of chs. 6 and 7 constitute the only resemblance between the two halves of this speech. The strophic framework of these and the other cantos of chs. 6 and 7, however, is again totally different. In ch. 6 we find predominantly strophes of three lines, whereas ch. 7 is almost exclusively built up of two-line strophes. Thus the independence of the chapters comes to light again.

---

[12] Habel (p. 141) also points to *k‘s* (6,2 and 5,2), *dk'* (6,9 and 4,19; see also 5,4), *twšyh* (6,13 and 5,12), *yr'h* (6,14 and 4,6; see also *yr'* in 6,21 and 5,21–22). He does not note, however, the correspondence between the responsions.

7 Bildad’s first speech: Job 8

Structure: 6.6.6.3 > 3.3|3.3|3.3|3

I	2	*‘d ’n TMLL ’lh*	*wrwḥ kbyr ’MRY PYK*	
	3	*h’***l** *y‘wt mšpṭ*	*w’m* **šdy** *y‘wt* **ṣdq**	
	4	*’m bnyk ḥṭ’w lw*	*wyšlḥm BYD pš‘m*	
	5	*’m ’th tšḥr ’l* **’l**	*w’l* **šdy** *ttḥnn*	
	6	*’m zk wyšr ’th*	*ky ‘th y‘yr ‘lyk*	*wšlm nwt* **ṣdq***k*
	7	*whyh r’šytk mṣ‘r*	*w’ḤRYTk YŚGH m’d*	
II	8	*ky š’l n’ ldr ryšwn*	*wkwnn lḥqr ’bwtm*	
	9	*ky tmwl ’nḥnw wl’ nd‘*	*ky ṣl ymynw ‘ly ’rṣ*	
	10	*hl’ hm ywrwk Y’MRW lk*	*wmlbm YWṢ’W MLYM*	
	11	*hyg’h gm’ bl’ bṣh*	*YŚGH ’ḥw bly mym*	
	12	*‘dnw b’bw l’ yqṭp*	*wlpny kl ḥṣyr yybš*	
	13	*kn ’RḤWT kl škḥy ’l*	*wtqwt ḥnp t’bd*	
III	14	*’šr yqwṭ kslw*	*w***byt** *‘kbyš mbṭḥw*	
	15	*yš‘n ‘l* **byt***w wl’ y‘md*	*YḤZYQ* **bw** *wl’* **yqwm**	
	16	*rṭb* **hw’** *lpny šmš*	*w‘l gntw ynqtw TṢ’*	
	17	*‘l gl šršyw ysbkw*	**byt** *’bnym yḥyh*	
	18	*’m ybl‘nw m***mqwm***w*	*wkḥš* **bw** *l’ r’ytyk*	
	19	*hn* **hw’** *mśwś DRKw*	*wm‘pr ’ḤR yṣmḥw*	
IV	20	*hn ’l l’ ym’s tm*	*wl’ YḤZYQ BYD mr‘ym*	
	21	*‘d ymlh śḥwq PYK*	*wśptyk trw‘h*	
	22	*śn’yk ylbšw bšt*	*w’hl rš‘ym ’ynnw*	

7.1 Text

V. 13a—*’rḥwt*: ‘ways’; so MT (= ‘destiny’, cf. Prov. 1,19; Dhorme, Horst, De Wilde, Michel). Most emend to *’ḥryt* (‘end’; cf. LXX).

V. 14a—*’šr yqwṭ kslw*: ’his confidence is cut off’; I take the hapax *yqwṭ* as a verb (Delitzsch, Michel, Hartley, Clines).

V. 17b—*byt ’bnym yḥyh*: “Dans une maison de pierres il ‘vit’ ” (Dhorme); see for *yḥyh* LXX. MT reads *yḥzh* (‘it sees’).

7.2 Content

Bildad lectures Job on God’s just administration.

- I Bildad’s teaching: God is righteous.
    - You speak foolishly: God does not unjustly act (vv. 2–4).
    - When you beg God for mercy, your bad luck will only be *temporary* (vv. 5–7).
- II Appeal to tradition: the wicked will perish.
    - Because we ourselves have no understanding, we have to take recourse to tradition (vv. 8–10).
    - Godless people come to an *untimely* end (vv. 11–13).
- III The seemingly prosperous existence of the wicked.
    - His stability is but outward appearance (vv. 14–16).
    - His prosperity is only *temporary* (vv. 17–19).
- IV Summary: God rehabilitates the blameless, but the wicked will decay.

7.3 Transition markers

7.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

7.3.1.1 *‘d ’n*, v. 2a
’lh, v. 2a
’th, v. 5a; ext. // *’th* in v. 6a
imperative: *š’l*, v. 8a
n’, v. 8a
h- interr., v. 11a
hn, v. 20a

7.3.1.2 no remarks

7.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

7.3.2.1 *m’d*, v. 7b
hm, v. 10a
’mr, v. 10a
tqwh, v. 13b
rš‘, v. 22b

7.3.2.2 *w-* beginning line, v. 7a
h- interr., v. 10a
ḥnp, v. 13b
hw’, v. 16a
hn, v. 19a
hw’, v. 19a

7.3.3 Contrary indications

h- interr., v. 3a
‘th, v. 6b
(*’nḥnw*, v. 9a†)

7.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

7.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’b* (‘father’)/ *’b* (‘bud’), vv. 8 and 12 resp.; *’ḥr*, vv. 7, 19; *’l* (‘God’), vv. 3, 5, 13, 20; *’l* (prep.), vv. 5, 5; *’m*, vv. 3, 4, 5, 6, 18; *’mr*, vv. 2, 10; *’th*, vv. 5, 6

b: *b-*, vv. 4, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20; *byt*, vv. 14, 15, 17

h: *h-* interr., vv. 3, 10, 11; *hw’*, vv. 16, 19; *hn*, vv. 19, 20

w: *-w*, vv. 4, 12, 14, 14, 15, 15, 16, 16, 17, 18, 18, 19

ḥ: *ḥzq*, vv. 15, 20

y: *yd*, vv. 4, 20; *yṣ’*, vv. 10, 16

k: *-k*, vv. 2, 4, 6, 6, 7, 7, 10, 10, 18, 21, 21, 22; *ky*, vv. 6, 8, 9, 9; *kl*, vv. 12, 13

l: *l-*, vv. 4, 8, 8, 10, 12, 16; *l’*, vv. 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 15, 18, 20, 20

m: *-m*, vv. 4, 4, 8, 10; *mll*, vv. 2, 10; *mn*, vv. 10, 18, 19

n: *-nw* (3 sing. masc.), vv. 18, 22 (cf. *-nw* in vv. 9b and 12a)

‘: *‘d* (= *‘wd*), vv. 12, 21 (cf. *‘d* in v. 2a); *‘wt*, v. 3, 3; *‘l*, vv. 6, 9 (*‘ly*), 15, 16, 17

p: *ph*, vv. 2, 21; *pnh*, vv. 12, 16

ṣ: *ṣdq*, vv. 3, 6

q: *qwm*, vv. 15, 18

r: *r’š*, vv. 7, 8

ś: *śgh*, vv. 7, 11

š: *šdy*, vv. 3, 5

7.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–4:	*‘d ’n/h-* interr., vv. 2a and 3a resp.—exactly linear
	’m, vv. 3b.4a
vv. 5–7:	*’m*, vv. 5a.6a—exactly linear
	’th, vv. 5a.6a!
vv. 8–10:	*ky*, vv. 8a.9a—exactly linear; see also v. 9b
	-m, vv. 8b.10b
vv. 11–13:	*b-*, vv. 11a.12a
	kl, vv. 12b.13a!
vv. 14–16:	*byt*, vv. 14b.15a
vv. 17–19:	*mn*, vv. 18a.19b

7.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–7 (canto I): *’l* // *šdy*, vv. 3.5!

'm, vv. 3–4.5–6—concatenatio
ṣdq, vv. 3b.6c!—exactly linear; see also *zkk* in v. 6a

vv. 8–13 (canto II): *'bwtm/b'bw*, vv. 8b and 12a resp.!—alliteration
h- interr., vv. 10a.11a—concatenatio

vv. 14–19 (canto III): *-w*, vv. 14–19
byt, vv. 14b.17b—exactly linear; see also v. 15a!
bw, vv. 15b.18b!—exactly linear; cf. also *l'* in vv. 15b and 18b
qwm, vv. 15b.18a!—linear
hw', vv. 16a.19a!—exactly linear
šmš/mśwś, vv. 16a and 19a resp. (allit.)—linear

7.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–4.8–10.14–16.20–22: *mll*, vv. 2a.10b! } chiasm (cf. Bezuidenhout,
'mr, vv. 2b.10a! p. 96)
tmll/tmwl/tm ... ymlh, vv. 2a, 9a and 20a+21a resp.—alliteration
'lh/'hl, vv. 2a and 22b resp. (alliteration) —inclusio
pyk, vv. 2b.21a!—'inclusio'
byd, vv. 4b.20b!—'inclusio'
-m, vv. 4b (2×).8b+10b!
yṣ', vv. 10b.16b!—linear
yḥzyq, vv. 15b.20b!

vv. 5–7.11–13.17–19: *'ḥr*, vv. 7b.19b!—exactly linear
'ḥryt/'rḥwt, vv. 7b and 13a resp. (alliter.) —linear
yśgh, vv. 7b.11b!
'rḥ/drk, vv. 13a and 19a resp.—exactly linear (Hontheim, p. 117)

vv. 7.8: *r'š*, vv. 7a.8a—concatenatio

vv. 19.20: *hn*, vv. 19a.20a!—concatenatio

7.4.5 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

7.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration
’l (‘God’), *’m*, *h-* interr., *-w*, *-k*, *ky*, *l’*, *mn*

7.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*’l* [prep.]), *l-*, *-nw*, (*‘wt*), *‘l*, *‘d*, *pnh*

7.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–16.17–19.20–22 (7×3)
Stickel (1842): 2–4.5–7.8–10|11–15.16–19.20–22 (3.3.3|5.4.3)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–15.16–19|20–22 (3.3|3.5.4|3)
Ewald (1854): 2–7|8–10.11–19|20–22; similarly Hartley (1988)
Merx (1871): 2–4.5–7.8–10|11–14.15–18.19–22 (3×6|3×8)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–15.16–19.20–22 (6.7.6.10.8.6; note p. 115 n. 1)
Wright (1883): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–16.17–19.20–22 (6.7.5×6)
Dillmann (1891): 2–4.5–7||8–10.11–13|14–16.17–19||20–22 (6.7||6.6|6.6||6)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.5+6b–c.8+10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22
Ley (1895): 2–7.8–13.14–19.20–22 (6.6.6.3)
Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5.6a+c–7|8–9.11–12.13+20.[14–15.16–17.18–19].21–22
Vetter (1897): (2) 3–4.5–7|8–10|11–12.13–14*.16–18|19–20.21–22
Hontheim (1904): 2–4.5–7|8–10|11–16.17–22 (3.3|3|6.6)
Schlögl (1916): 2–10.11–19.20–22 (18.18.6)
Löhr (1920): 2–3.4–5a+6b.6a+c–7.8–9|11–12.13+15.19–20.21–22 (4×2|4×2)
Ball (1922): 2–3.4–5.6b–7.8+10.11–12.13–14.16–17.18–19.20–21
Peters (1928): 2–3.4–5.6–7|8–10.11–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–22 (3×2|3.3.3×2|3)
König (1929): 2–7.8–19.20–22; similarly Weiser (1968)
Kissane (1939): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–15+18.16–17+19.20–22 (7×3); similarly Skehan (1961)
Irwin (1946): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13|14–15.16–17.18–19|20–22 (3.3|3.3|2.2.2|3); similarly Irwin (1933), note p. 207
Möller (1955): 2–7.8–10.11–19.20–22 (6.3.9.3); cf. Ewald (1854)
Fohrer (1963): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13.14–15+19.16–18|20–22 (7×3); cf. Kissane (1939)
Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–12|13–15.16–17|18–19.20–22; cf. TOB (1978)
Epping-Nelis (1968): 2–4.5+6b–7|8–10|11–13.14–19|20–22

Horst (1968): 2–7||8–10.11–13|14–19||20–22 (6||3.3|6||3); cf. Dillmann (1891)
KBS (1980): 2–10.11–19.20–22
Murphy (1981): 2–4|5–7|8–10.11–12.13|14–19|20–22 (7×3)
De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.6b–7|8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18–19| 20+6a+21–22
Van Selms (1982): 2–7.8–15.16–22
Webster (1983): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–15.16–19.20–22
Habel (1985): 2–7|8.9–10.11.12–19.20|21–22
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–3.4–7||8–10.11–12.13–15.16–19||20–22
Michel (1987): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–15.16–19.20–21.22
Clines (1989): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13.14–15.16–19|20–22; cf. Michel (1987)
MacKenzie (1990): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13.14–16.17–19|20–22 (7×3)

7.6 Comments and summary

On the face of it, it seems quite in accordance with the thematic structure of the poem, when many scholars divide the speech of Bildad in ch. 8 into three main parts: vv. 2–7 (‘God’s just ways’), 8–19 (‘evidence of God’s justice’), 20–22 (‘conclusion and application’).[1] Then, within the second of these main parts, Dillmann and Horst distinguish between vv. 8–13 and 14–19. In this context Horst correctly points out that vv. 13 and 19 ‘deutlich Abschlüsse markieren’.[2] The explicit reference to the ruin of the wicked in v. 13b, is indeed characteristic of the end of a strophe or a canto; cf. v. 22 and 11,20.[3] Thus, it is not without reason that Ley and Irwin divided this poem into three identical units of six lines (vv. 2–7, 8–13, 14–19), and a concluding strophe of three lines (vv. 20–22); cf. also Murphy.

The analysis of the verbal repetitions supports the view of Ley and Irwin, that it was really the poet’s aim to shape his composition very regularly into three six-line cantos, which are terminated by a three-line strophe. The end of these cantos is especially marked by the root *’ḥr* and the alliteration, which is connected with this root, *’ḥryt*/ *’rḥwt*; see anal.

---

[1] So Schlottmann, Ewald, Dillmann, König, Fohrer, Horst, Weiser, De Wilde, Hartley, Clines; cf. also Habel (anal. 7.5). The descriptions are Hartley’s.

[2] Cf. also Irwin (1933), p. 207: ‘v. 13 is certainly a summary’; and Clines: ‘The conclusion of each section is signaled clearly: ... in v. 19 by the announcement of doom for the wicked’.

[3] The cantos of the Psalms, too, often conclude with such a reference; cf. especially the last colon of Ps. 1 (*wdrk rš‘ym t’bd*). See further Ps. 25,3 37,17 68,12 72,4 107,42 145,20 147,6. In Job 8,13b we meet with the root *’bd* (‘to perish’), just as in 11,20 and Ps. 1,6. This root also plays an important part at the end of the cantos in ch. 4 (see above 3.6)!

7.4.4. These words only occur in the *final* lines of the cantos! Furthermore, there is an obvious correspondence between *’rḥwt* (‘paths’) in v. 13a and *drk* (‘way’) in v. 19a. See also *yśgh* in anal. 7.4.4. Compare further *kn* and *hn* (*hw’*) at the beginning of vv. 13 and 19 respectively. These particles introduce the concluding lines of the cantos; cf. *kn hy’* in 5,27. Thus, we may safely assume that the caesura between vv. 13 and 14 is equivalent, at least formally, to the caesuras after vv. 7 and 19. This observation is corroborated by the analysis of the verbal repetitions which mark the beginning of the cantos; see *yṣ’* and *yḥzyq* in anal. 7.4.4.

From a thematic point of view there is no distinct turn in the development of the contents between the second and the third cantos. The relative pronoun *’šr* at the beginning of canto III also points in this direction. Nevertheless, this canto distinguishes itself from the preceding one and is more than ‘blosse Kolorierung’ (Horst, p. 128). Here, stress is laid on the prosperity of the wicked; note the following words *ksl* (‘confidence’, v. 14), *mbṭḥ* (‘trust’, v. 14), *byt* (‘house’, vv. 14, 15, 17), *rṭb* (‘lush’, v. 16). It is not denied by Bildad that in some way the wicked do prosper. However, their prosperity is only outward appearance (vv. 14–15) and of short duration (vv. 18–19).[4] Cf. for *’šr* at the beginning of a new canto Ps. 64,4,[5] and for *’šr* at the beginning of a strophe Job 9,15 and 17. The enjambement between cantos II and III matches the obvious concatenations between cantos I and II, and cantos III and IV; see *r’š* and *hn* in anal. 7.4.4.

The final strophe (vv. 20–22) is a summary of the preceding cantos (see anal. 7.2).[6] Formally this strophe is totally integrated into the overall structure of the poem; see anal. 7.4.4 and cf. Bezuidenhout (p. 96). V. 20 does not refer to the preceding verses (as against Habel), but introduces vv. 21–22. V. 20a is elaborated in v. 21, and v. 20b in v. 22 (Van Selms, Bezuidenhout).

Advocates of strophic structure generally agree that especially the beginning of this poem consists of three-line strophes (see anal. 7.5). These units can be established on the grounds of their contents; see anal. 7.2. From v. 14 onwards this regularity is not as obvious as one might wish. Therefore Irwin assumes that the poet switches to strophes of two lines; cf. Clines. Kissane and Skehan transpose v. 18 to follow vv. 14–15, in order to save the three-line structure. With the same purpose Fohrer transposes v. 19 (see anal. 7.5). The analysis of the verbal repetitions, however, shows that such transpositions altogether destroy the formal framework of the third canto. It is true, from a thematic point of view there is no caesura between the third and the fourth line of this canto as was positively the case in the preceding cantos. However, when we take into consideration the verbal repetitions within canto III, this canto distinguishes itself from the preceding ones as well; see anal. 7.4.3. We can establish a linear pattern in the words which are repeated. And this pattern is most obvious if we assume a break between vv. 16 and 17; see *byt*, *bw*, *qwm*, *hw’*, and *šmš/mśwś*! In this way, the repetitions create a formal *parallelismus stropharum.*[7]

---

[4] ‘Trügerisch ist ihr Glück, plötzlich erfolgt ihr Sturz’ (Ley). According to Habel we meet in vv. 8–20 a parable of two plants: the plant that withers (vv. 12–15) and the plant that survives (vv. 16–19); cf. also Hartley, p. 162. On the basis of my structural analysis this interpretation may be excluded. Vv. 14–15 cannot be loosened from the following verses. Habel’s translation of *’ḥr* in v. 19b (‘that from the dust it shoots up *elsewhere*’) is also rather strained.

[5] See STR, pp. 292–95.

[6] Cf. part VI, 1.2.3.

The *quintessential thought* of ch. 8 we find in the first and the last strophe of the poem. Bildad stresses that *God does not act unjustly*; note *mšpṭ // ṣdq* in v. 3 (cf. *ṣdq* in v. 6c). This just administration is explicitly formulated in v. 20: God saves the blameless and punishes the wicked. ‘The sentence crystallizes the whole retributionist theology, and presents a positive statement of the principle of moral order that (lies) behind the questions of v. 3’ (Clines). Thus, the poem as a whole is framed by a thematic inclusio.

With the theme of God’s justice Bildad ties in with the leading idea of the first poem of Job’s reply to Eliphaz (ch. 6), in which Job stresses his own integrity and *righteousness*; note *ṣdq* in 6,29.[8] This connection is reinforced by the formulation which is used by Bildad in the second colon of his speech: *wrwḥ kbyr ’mry pyk*; cf. 6,25–26, especially *wlrwḥ ’mry n’š* (6,26b). Bildad confirms that Job’s words are like a ‘wind’ indeed. This relationship points out the reproaching character of Bildad’s speech. In addition, there is an obvious connection here with Job’s lament in ch. 7. It is surely not by accident that the words of Bildad wind up with the expression *’ynnw* (‘it will be no more’). This expression reminds us of an important key-word in the preceding poem; see *w’ynny* in 7,8b and 21d.[9] See also the root *šḥr* (‘to seek eagerly’) in 8,5 and 7,21.[10] By these verbal repetitions the reproaching character of Bildad’s first speech once more comes to light: ‘Job should be searching diligently for God rather than imagining that God would some day search eagerly for him’ (Hartley).[11]

---

[7] See also the including structure of v. 16: *rṭb ... tṣ’* (last line of the strophe).

[8] Before ch. 8 the root *ṣdq* only occurs in 4,17 and 6,29.

[9] I am not sure that we should interpret this relationship, with Habel, as an *ironic* allusion.

[10] For the root *šḥr* in the book of Job see also 24,5†.

[11] Similarly Hontheim, p. 116.

8 Job’s first reply to Bildad (1): Job 9

Structure: 11.12.11 > 3.3.3.2||2.2.2|2.2.2||2.3.3.3

I	2	*’mnm* **yd‘ty** *KY KN*	**wmh** *yṣdq ’nwš ‘M ’L*	
	3	*’m yḥpṣ lryb ‘MW*	*l’ y‘nnw ’ḥt MNY ’lp*	
	4	*ḥkm lbb w’myṣ kḥ*	**my** *hqšh* **’lyw** *wyšlm*	
	5	*hm‘tyq hrym wl’* **yd‘w**	*’šr hpkm b’pw*	
	6	*hmrgyz ’rṣ mmqwmh*	*w‘mwdyh ytplṣwn*	
	7	**h’mr** *lḥrs wl’ yzrḥ*	*wb‘d kwkbym yḥtm*	
	8	*nṭh šmym lbdw*	*wdwrk ‘l bmty ym*	
	9	*‘śh ‘š ksyl wkymh*	*whdry tmn*	
	10	*‘śh gdlwt ‘d ’yn ḥqr*	*wnpl’wt ‘d ’yn mspr*	
	11	*hn y‘br ‘LY wl’ ’r’h*	*wyḥlp wl’ ’byn lw*	
	12	*hn yḥtp* **my** *yšybnw*	**my y’mr ’lyw mh** *t‘śh*	

II.1	13	*’LWH l’* YŠYB *’pw*	*tḥtw šḥḥw ‘zry rhb*	
	14	*’p* KY *’nky ’‘nnw*	*’bḥrh dbry ‘MW*	
	15	’ŠR *’m ṣdqty l’ ’‘nh*	*lmšpṭy ’tḥnn*	
	16	*’m qr’ty wy‘nny*	*l’ ’’myn* KY *y’zyn qwly*	
	17	’ŠR *bś‘rh yšwpny*	*whrbh pṣ‘y ḥnm*	
	18	*l’* **ytnny** HŠB *rwḥy*	KY *yśb‘ny mmrrym*	
II.2	19	’M *lkḥ ’myṣ hnh*	w’M lMŠPṬ MY *yw‘ydnw*	
	20	’M *’ṣdq py* YRŠY‘*ny*	*tm ’ny wy‘qšny*	
	21	*tm ’ny l’ ’d‘ npšy*	*’m’s ḥyy*	
	22	*’ḥt hy’ ‘l kn ’mrty*	*tm* wRŠ‘ HW’ *mklh*	
	23	’M *šwṭ ymyt pt’m*	*lmst nqym yl‘g*	
	24	*’rṣ* **ntnh** *bYD* RŠ‘	*pny* ŠPṬY*h yksh*	’M *l’ ’pw’* MY HW’

III	25	*wymy qlw MNY rṣ*	*brḥw l’ r’w ṭwbh*
	26	*ḥlpw ‘M ’nywt ’bh*	*knšr yṭwś ‘ly ’kl*

[27] **’m** *’mry ’škḥh śyḥy*   *’‘zbh pny w’blygh*
[28] *ygrty kl ‘ṣbty*   *yd‘ty* **ky l’** *tnqny*
[29] **’nky** *’rš‘*   *lmh zh hbl ’yg‘*

[30] **’m** *htrḥṣty bmw šlg*   *whzkwty bbr kpy*
[31] *’z bšḥt ṭṭblny*   *wt‘bwny ślmwty*
[32] **ky l’** *’yš kmny ’‘nnw*   *nbw’ yḥdw bmšpṭ*

[33] *lw yš bynynw mwkyḥ*   *yšt YDw ‘l šnynw*
[34] *ysr m‘LY šbṭw*   *w’mtw ’l tb‘tny*
[35] *’dbrh wl’ ’yr’nw*   *KY* **l’** *KN* **’nky** *‘mdy*

8.1 Text

V. 8b—*bmty ym*: ‘the back (cf. Ugaritic *bmt*) of Sea’; see W.F. Albright, *JBL* 57 (1938), p. 227.

V. 9a—*‘š*: so MT; cf. *‘yš* in 38,32.

V. 17a—*bś‘rh*: ‘with a tempest’; so MT (Kroeze, Habel, Hartley; cf. Michel). Many critics revocalize MT and read ‘for a hair’, following Targum and Pesh. (so recently Gordis and Clines).

V.19a—*hnh*: ‘see’; so MT. Revocalization to ‘see him’ seems necessary (Clines).

V. 19b—*yw‘ydnw*: ‘he summons Him’. MT *yw‘ydny* (‘He summons me’); this may be a *tiqqun sopherîm*, a deliberate scribal alteration for reverential reasons (Gordis).

V. 27a—*’mry*: so MT; is usually emended to *’mrty* (e.g., by Gordis, De Wilde and Hartley).

V. 30a—*bmw*: ‘with’; so K. Q *bmy* (‘with water’).

V. 30a—*bmw šlg*: ‘with soapwort’; so most modern commentators. Michel reads ‘with water from snow’; cf. J.C. de Moor, *UF* 1 (1969), pp. 181–82.

V. 33a—*lw(/l’) yš*: ‘would that’ (cf. 16,4), introduces the protasis with v. 35 as the apodosis (Gordis; cf. anal. 8.6 below). MT *l’ yš* (‘there is not’) is not found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.

V. 35b: lit. ‘for I am not thus with myself’; this colon refers to the possibility of unfearful speech with God (Clines).

8.2 Content

Job about God: God’s exalted power and the futility of a legal procedure.

I God’s overwhelming power in nature—*in general* (but note v. 11: personal).

In front of God a human being is never in the right—human weakness (vv. 2–4).

God’s destructive power (vv. 5–7).

God's creative power (vv. 8–10).
No one can call Him to account for what He is doing—human weakness (vv. 11–12; cf. vv. 2–4).

II God's overwhelming power *before Job.*
- II.1 Because this all powerful God (v. 13) plunges me into great misery (vv. 17–18) I would not know how to answer Him (vv. 14–16).
- II.2 Because this all powerful God (v. 19; cf. v. 13) allows injustice a free hand on earth (vv. 23–24) I myself, too, as an innocent person am destroyed together with the wicked (vv. 20–22).

III Job's weakness *before God.*
My life rushes past in misery (vv. 25–26).
I am permanently confronted with my misery (vv. 27–28) and I am not able to resist my fate (v. 29).
If I should purify myself You(!) would shower me with 'guilt' (vv. 30–31), and I am not able to resist Him (v. 32; cf. v. 29).
If only there was a mediator between us (vv. 33-34), then, I would be able to defend myself (v. 35; cf. vv. 29 and 32).

8.3 Transition markers

8.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

8.3.1.1 *'mnm*, v. 2a
mh, v. 2b
'nwš, v. 2b
hn, v. 11a; // *hn* in v. 12a
hnh, v. 19a
my, v. 19b
'ny, v. 21a
w- beginning line, v. 25a
*lw**, v. 33a

8.3.1.2 *'mr*, v. 27a

8.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

8.3.2.1 *'mr*, v. 7a
'mr, v. 12b
'p, v. 14a
'nky, v. 14a
hy', v. 22a
rš', v. 22b
rš', v. 24a
'nky, v. 29a
zh, v. 29b
'nky, v. 35b

8.3.2.2 *my*, v. 4b
my, v. 12a
my, v. 12b
mh, v. 12b
'pw', v. 24c
my, v. 24c
hw', v. 24c; ext. // *hw'* in v. 22b
lmh, v. 29b
cohortative: *'dbrh*, v. 35a

8.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

cohortative: *’bḥrh*, v. 14b
’ny, v. 20b
’z, v. 31a
’l (prohib.), v. 34b

8.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

8.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’ḥt*, vv. 3, 22; *’yn*, vv. 10, 10; *’l*/*’lwh* (‘God’), vv. 2 and 13 resp.; *’l* (prep.), vv. 4, 12 (cf. *’l* prohib. in v. 34); *’m*, vv. 3, 15, 16, 19, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 30; *’mn*, vv. 2, 16; *’mṣ*, vv. 4, 19; *’mr*, vv. 7, 12, 22, 27; *’ny*, vv. 20, 21; *’nky*, vv. 14, 29, 35; *’p* (‘anger’), vv. 5, 13 (cf. *’p* in v. 14); *’rṣ*, vv. 6, 24; *’šr*, vv. 5, 15, 17

b: *b-*, v.v. 5, 7, 17, 24, 30, 30, 31, 32

d: *dbr*, vv. 14, 35

h: *h-* (article), vv. 5, 6, 7; *-h*, vv. 6, 6, 24; *hw’*, vv. 22, 24; *hn*/*hnh*, vv. 11, 12, 19

w: *-w*, vv. 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 13, 14, 32, 33, 34, 34

ḥ: *ḥlp*, vv. 11, 26

y: *-y*, vv. 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 21, 25, 27 (3×), 28, 30, 31, 34, 35; *yd*, vv. 24, 33; *yd‘*, vv. 2, 5, 21, 28

k: *k-*, vv. 26, 32; *kḥ*, vv. 4, 19; *ky*, vv. 2, 14, 16, 18, 28, 32, 35; *kn*, vv. 2, 22, 35

l: *l-*, vv. 3, 7, 8, 11, 15, 19, 19, 23, 29; *l’*, vv. 3, 5, 7, 11, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 32, 33*, 35, 35

m: *mh*, vv. 2, 12, 29; *-mw*, vv. 30*, 32; *my*, vv. 4, 12, 12, 19, 24; *mn*, vv. 6, 34; *mny*, vv. 3, 25

n: *-nw* (3 sing. masc.), vv. 3, 12, 14, 19*, 32, 35; *-nw* (1 plural), vv. 33, 33; *-ny*, vv. 16, 17, 18, 18, 19*, 20, 20, 28, 31, 31, 32, 34; *nqh*, vv. 23, 28; *ntn*, vv. 18, 24

‘: *‘d*, vv. 7, 10, 10; *‘l*, vv. 8, 11, 22, 26 (*‘ly*), 33, 34; *‘m*, vv. 2, 3, 14, 26, 35 (*‘md*); *‘nh*, vv. 3, 14, 15, 16, 32; *‘śh*, vv. 9, 10, 12

p: *pnh*, vv. 24, 27

ṣ: *ṣdq*, vv. 2, 15, 20

r: *r’h*, vv. 11, 25; *rš‘*, vv. 20, 22, 24, 29

š: *šwb*, vv. 12, 13, 18; *špṭ*, vv. 15, 19, 24, 32

t: *tmm*, vv. 20, 21, 22

8.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–4: *‘m ’l*/*‘mw*, vv. 2b and 3a respectively
’l/*’lp*/*’lyw*, vv. 2b, 3b and 4b resp.—alliteration
vv. 5–7: *hm‘tyq*/*hmrgyz*/*h’mr*, vv. 5a, 6a and 7a resp. (alliter.) —exactly linear
wl’, vv. 5a.7a—inclusio
b-, vv. 5b.7b—inclusio
vv. 8–10: *‘śh*, vv. 9a.10a—exactly linear
vv. 11–12: *hn*, vv. 11a.12a—exactly linear
vv. 13–14: *’pw*/*’p*, vv. 13a and 14a resp.—alliteration
vv. 15–16: *’m*, vv. 15a.16a
l’, vv. 15a.16b
‘nh, vv. 15a.16a—linear
vv. 19–20: *’m*, vv. 19a.20a—exactly linear; see also v. 19b
vv. 21–22: *tm*, vv. 21a.22b
vv. 23–24: *’m*, vv. 23a.24c
vv. 30–32: *b-*, vv. 30a+b.31a.32b
-mw, vv. 30a*.32a!—inclusio
vv. 33–34: *-nw* (1 plural)/*-nw* (3 sing. masc.), vv. 33a+b and 35a resp. —alliteration
‘l, vv. 33b.34a

8.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 13–18 (II.1): *šwb* hiph‘il, vv. 13a.18a—inclusio
yšyb/*yśb‘ny*, vv. 13a and 18b resp. (alliter.)—inclusio
rhb/*whrbh*, vv. 13b and 17b resp.—alliteration
ky, vv. 14a.16b.18b—linear
‘nh, vv. 14a.15a—concatenatio
’šr, vv. 15a.17a—exactly linear (cf. v. 5b)!
’tḥnn/*ḥnm*, vv. 15b and 17b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear

vv. 19–24 (II.2): *’m*, vv. 19a+b+20a.23a+24c—inclusio
l-, vv. 19a+b.23b—‘inclusio’
špṭ, vv. 19b.24b—inclusio
my, vv. 19b.24c—inclusio; cf. canto I!
rš‘, vv. 20a.22b.24a—linear (cf. v. 29a)!
tm ’ny, vv. 20b.21a—concatenatio
hw’, vv. 22b.24c!—linear; see also *hy’* in v. 22a

8.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–12 (canto I): *yd‘*, vv. 2a.5a—linear
mh, vv. 2b.12b—inclusio
-nw (3 sing.), vv. 3b.12a
my, vv. 4b.12a+b—linear; cf. II.2!
’lyw, vv. 4b.12b!—linear
wl’, vv. 5a+7a.11a+b
’mr, vv. 7a.12b—linear
b‘d/‘d, vv. 7b and 10a+b respectively—linear
‘l, vv. 8b.11a—linear
‘śh, vv. 10a.12b—linear; cf. also v. 9a!

vv. 13–24 (canto II): *’pw/’pw’*, vv. 13a and 24c resp. (allit.)—inclusio
ṣdq, vv. 15a.20a
špṭ, vv. 15b.19b } chiasm; see also *špṭ* in v. 24b
b-, vv. 17a.24a—linear
ntn, vv. 18a.24a!—exactly linear

vv. 25–35 (canto III): *k-*, vv. 26b.32a!—linear
‘ly/‘ly, vv. 26b and 34a resp. (alliter.); see also *‘l* in v. 33b—inclusio
’m, vv. 27a.30a—exactly linear
ky l’, vv. 28b.32a.35b!
’nky, vv. 29a.35b—linear (cf. v. 14a)!
kp/yd, vv. 30b and 33b respectively—linear
wt‘bwny/tb‘tny, vv. 31b and 34b resp. (alliter.) —linear
-nw (3 sing.), vv. 32a.35a—exactly linear

8.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–7.13–18.25–26: *’mn*, vv. 2a.16b!
ṣdq, vv. 2b.15a
‘m, vv. 2b+3a.14b.26a!—linear; note *‘m ’l/‘mw* in vv. 2–3 and 14b! resp.
’l/’lwh, vv. 2b and 13a resp.!—exactly linear
‘nh + *-nw* (3 sing.), vv. 3b.14a—linear; see also *‘nh* in vv. 15a and 16a
mny, vv. 3b.25a!—linear
’pw, vv. 5b.13a!

’bḥrh/brḥw, vv. 14b and 25b resp. (alliter.) —linear

vv. 8–12.19–24.27–35: *‘l*, vv. 8b+11a.22a.33b+34a!; note *‘ly* in vv. 11a and 34a—linear
’r’h/’yr’nw, vv. 11a and 35a resp. (alliter.) —linear
byn/byn, vv. 11b and 33a resp. (allit.)—linear
*lw/lw**, vv. 11b and 33a resp. (alliter.)—linear
my, vv. 12a+b.24c—exactly linear; see also v. 19b
-nw (3 sing.), vv. 12a.35a—exactly linear; see also vv. 19b and 32a
špṭ, vv. 19b+24b.32b
rš‘, vv. 20a+22b+24a.29a!
yd‘, vv. 21a.28b
kn, vv. 22a.35b
’mr, vv. 22a.27a
nqh, vv. 23b.28b!
yd, vv. 24a.33b!—linear
pnh, vv. 24b.27b!

vv. 2–12.25–35, inclusio: *ky … kn*, vv. 2a.35a! (Habel, p. 183)
‘m/‘md, vv. 2b+3a and 35b respectively
’l (‘God’)/*’l* (proh.), vv. 2b and 34b resp. —alliteration
‘nh, vv. 3b.32a
mn, vv. 6a.34a!
wl’ ’r’h/l’ r’w, vv. 11a.25b!
ḥlp, vv. 11b.26a!

vv. 11–12.13–14: *šwb* hiph‘il, vv. 12a.13a—concatenatio

see also: *w’myṣ kḥ/lkḥ ’myṣ*, vv. 4a and 19a resp.!—chiasm
’nky … dbr/dbr … ’nky, vv. 14 and 35 resp.!—chiasm

8.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

8.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
’m (v. 3), *’nky* (v. 14), *-w*, *-y*, *l-*, *l’*

8.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
'ḥt, ('yn), 'rṣ, -h, -ny

8.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–16.17–19.20–22.23–24.25–26.27–29. 30–31.32–33.34–35|... (7×3.2.2.3.2.2.2|...)

Stickel (1842): 2–3.4–6|7–10.11–15.16–20.21–24|25–26.27–28|29–33.34–35... (2.3|4.5.5.4|2.2|5.2...)

Schlottmann (1851): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12|13–16.17–20.21–24|25–28.29–31. 32–35|... (3.3.3.2|4.4.4|4.3.4|...); similarly Dillmann (1869)

Ewald (1854): 2–3.4–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–24.25–28.29. 30–33.34–10,1|...

Merx (1871): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–16.17–20.21–24.25–28.29–32|33–35... (4×6|6.4×8|6...)

Hitzig (1874): 2–13.14–24|25–31.32–35|... (12.11|7.4|...)

Delitzsch 1876): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–15.16–20.21–24.25–28.29–33|34–10,2... (6.6.6.10.10.9.8.10|9...)

Wright (1883): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–16.17–20.21a+22–24|25–28.29–32. 33–35|... (4×6|6.8.8|8.8.6|...)

Dillmann (1891): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12||13–16.17–20.21–24|25–28.29–31. 32–35||... (6.6.6.4||8.8.9|8.6.8||...); cf. Schlottmann (1851)

Bickell (1894): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8+10.11–12.13–14.15+17.18–19.20–21a+22a. 22b–24a.25–26.27–28.30–31.32–33.34–35...

Ley (1895): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–16.17–20.21–24.25–28.29–32.33–35 (5×3.4×4.3); cf. Merx (1871)

Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5.6–7.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22+24c. 23–24b|25–26.27–28.30–31.32–33.34–35|...

Vetter (1897): 2–4|5–7.8–10|11–20|21–24|25–28|29–35|...

Hontheim (1904): 2–10|11–19||20–21+29+22–24||25–28|30–33||34–10,2||... (9.9|6|4.4|4|...)

Schlögl (1916): 2–12.13–23.24–35 (22.22.22)

Ball (1922): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22.25–26. 27–28.30–31.32–33.34–35...

Peters (1928): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–21|22–24.25–26. 27–28.29–31.32–33.34–35|... (3.3.3.4×2.3|3.2.2.3.2.2|...)

König (1929): 2–10.11–20.21–28.29–35...

Kissane (1939): 2–7.8–13.14–19.20–21+29+22–24.25–28+30–31.|32–10,1... (6×6...)

Irwin (1946): 2–3.11–12.13–14|15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24.25–26. 27–28|30–31.32–33.34–35|... ('couplets')

Möller (1955): 2–10.11–15.16–24; 25–34... (9.5.9; 10...)
Skehan (1961): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12|13–15.16–18.19–21.22–24||25–28.29–31.32–10,1a||... (3.3.3.2|4×3||4.3.4||...; vv. 34–35a is a tricolon); similarly MacKenzie (1990); cf. Epping-Nelis (1968)
Fohrer (1963): 2–4.[5–10: hymn].11–14.15–18.19–21.22–24a+c|25–28.29–31.32–35|... (3.4.4.3.3|4.3.4|...)
Terrien (1963): 2–4|5–7.8–10|11–13||14–16|17–18.19–21|22–24||25–26.27–29|30–32.33–35|...
Horst (1968): 2–4.5–7.8–10|11–17.18–24|25–31.32–35 (3.3.3.7.7.7.4)
TOB (1978): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–18.19–24|25–26.27–31.32–35
KBS (1980): 2–4.5–10.11–17.18–24.25–31.32–35
De Wilde (1981): 2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22.23–24|25–26.27–28.29.30–31.32–33.34–35...
Van Selms (1982): 2–13.14–24.25–35...
Webster (1983): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–15.16–18.19–21.22–24; 25–28.29–31.32–35...
Habel (1985): 2–4|5–13|14–15.16–18.19–20|21–24|25–26.27–29.30–31.32–35|...
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–4.5–7.8–10|11–14.15–18|19–21.22–24||25–26.27–28.29–31.32–33.34–35||...
Michel (1987): 2–4.5–10.11–12.13–15.16–18.19–22.23–24.25–26.27–29.30–31.32–35
Hartley (1988): 2–4.5–13.14–24|25–35||...
Clines (1989): 2–4.5–10.11–13.14–16.17–20.21–24|25–31.32–35... (3.6.3.3.4.4|2.5.4...)

8.6 Comments and summary

In regard of chs. 9–10 Ley already noted: 'Auch diese zweite Gegenrede Hiobs besteht aus zwei Teilen, welchen die Kapitelabteilung entspricht'.[1] This observation about the coincidence of the chapter division and the length of the poems is again, in my opinion, a good starting point for an inquiry into the rhetorical structure of this speech (cf. above on Job 4–5 and 6–7). In ch. 9 God is generally referred to in the third person, except in vv. 28b and 31a. By analogy with Job's answer to Eliphaz (chs. 6–7), we may assume that in this first part of his speech Job is speaking to his friends (cf. ch. 6), although they are nowhere addressed directly (Horst). In ch. 10 Job addresses himself explicitly to God; see vv. 3–22. The following rhetorical investigations will produce further evidence that we are dealing with two different—relatively independent—poems, each of which exhibits its own structural rules.

---

[1] Ley (1895), p. 649. So also Köster, Schlögl, Horst, Hartley; as against Clines a.o.

As to ch. 9, it may be observed that critics have generally failed to appreciate the beautiful rhetorical structure of the poem. Thus Habel states that the design of chs. 9–10 is 'not characterized by a series of balanced units (as in ch. 7) or a neat symmetrical structure (as 36:8–15)' (p. 184). Nothing is further from the truth. The failure to grasp the well-considered, balanced and symmetrical, framework of ch. 9 is partially due to an underestimation of the formal features that determine its overall structure. Among these features the device of inclusio takes a prominent place. This device in the first place defines the span of the poem as a whole: see the repetition of *ky kn/ky ... kn* in vv. 2a and 35b respectively.[2]

As a consequence of failing to appreciate its formal framework there have been different opinions about the arrangement of ideas in ch. 9. Many scholars discern *two* main parts and put a caesura between vv. 24 and 25.[3] Others, however, put this main break before (Dillmann) or after (Merx) v. 13, or between vv. 21 and 22 (Peters). Other critics, again, discern *three* main parts in this chapter. But in that case there is no unanimity about the correct position of the first break: vv. 2–12, 13–24, 25–35 (Schlottmann, Dillmann [1869] and MacKenzie; cf. Skehan); 2–13, 14–24, 25–35 (Wright, Terrien, TOB, Van Selms; cf. Merx); vv. 2–10, 11–24, 25–35 (Horst).[4]

These data show that there is some unanimity as to the caesura between vv. 24 and 25. From v. 25 onwards, according to Horst, 'hebt die Rede mit dem Vorbringen von Klagemotiven neu an'. Next, the copula in an adversative sense and the subject of the sentence in first position in v. 25a are markers of a new topic in the style of the laments.[5] Such being the case the problem remains whether the poem shows a second main break, and if so, where we must position it. Here we meet a fine example of a phenomenon that can also be observed elsewhere in Hebrew poetry. When thematic considerations regarding the delimitation of the poetic units place the student in a dilemma, then, formal devices show the way out of the problems.[6] In my opinion, a close inspection of the verbal repetitions proves that a division of this poem into three main parts (cantos) as discerned by Schlottmann (vv. 2–12, 13–24, 25–35; see also RSV) is preferable to all the other groupings of ideas. Formally seen, the beginning of canto II (vv. 13–24) is indicated by the word *’lwh* (‘God’) in v. 13, first word of the line. This designation forms a responsio with *’l* (‘God’) in v. 2b, last word of the line. Words for God do not occur elsewhere in the poem! The corresponding words cannot be interpreted as an inclusio in canto I. If one takes v. 13 as the last line of the first canto, then, the parallel framework of canticles II.1 and II.2 falls to pieces (see for this parallelism below). Cf. the responsions by *’l/ ’lwh* and *šdy/ ’lwh* on the level of the composition as a whole in chs. 5 and 6.[7] See also *‘m* (*‘mw*), *‘nh* and *’pw* in anal. 8.4.5.[8] The beginning of the third canto (vv. 25–35) is indicated by the particle *mny* (‘than’). We come across this word only in the *first* line of canto III (v. 25a) and in the second line of canto I (v. 3b). See also *‘m* (‘with’) in anal. 8.4.5.

---

[2] The combination of these words within a colon does not occur anywhere else in the book of Job!

[3] So Hitzig, Duhm, Möller, Skehan, Fohrer, De Wilde, Webster, Bezuidenhout, Hartley, Clines; see anal. 8.5. According to Hartley vv. 2–24 describe 'Job's Concerns about Disputing His Case with God' and vv. 25–35 'Job's Inability to Demonstrate His Innocence'. Cf. with these descriptions: 'Die absolute Gerechtigkeit Gottes' (vv. 2–24), 'Der verzäunte Weg' (vv. 25–35); so Weiser. Critics like Möller and Webster even assume that the caesura between vv. 24 and 25 represents a break between two poems.

[4] However, Horst admits that the break between vv. 10 and 11 is not clearly marked; see his comment on vv. 11–12. From v. 11 onwards, according to Horst, the 'Ich-Aussagen' predominate.

[5] See C. Westermann, *Lob und Klage in den Psalmen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 5th ed 1977, pp. 51–55. See for the sequence subject-verb also vv. 13a, 24a, 29a. The caesura between vv. 24 and 25 cannot be characterized as the transition from monologue to personal address; see vv. 32 and 34 (as against Clines). The direction of the address is not a reliable criterion for the rhetorical separation of poetic units; cf.

The end of the cantos is especially marked by the expression *‘ly* (‘above me’) and the noun *yd* (‘hand’); see anal. 8.4.5—cf. also *my* (‘who’) in vv. 12 and 24.[9] Analysis 8.4.5 furthermore shows that this pattern of verbal repetitions is not restricted to the mere beginning and end of the cantos, but controls these units in their entirety. It may further be observed that the whole poem is built up out of bicola and that the last line of canto II forms an exception to this regularity; this is a tricolon (v. 24). In the context of the other formal devices we may take this line as another feature which marks the end of the second canto.[10] The third colon (v. 24c) also underlines the content of the preceding unit. This colon functions as a

---

below, about chs. 12–14. See for *tnqny* in v. 28b the ‘allusion’ on 10,14b.

[6] Cf. the considerations about the caesura between 8,13 and 14 in analysis 7.6 above.

[7] According to Habel the verbs *yd‘* (‘to know’) and *’mr* (‘to say’) are ‘obvious markers’ which determine the movement of the speech. In my opinion, this only applies to vv. 2–12 (canto I).

[8] Note also the externally parallel repetition of *hn* (‘behold’) just at the beginning of vv. 11 and 12—anaphora. Does this device mark the end of canto I? Cf. the same device at the end of the cantos in ch. 5, but see also *‘śh* in vv. 9–10 and *’m* in vv. 19–20.

[9] On first thoughts it may not seem very convincing that the overall structure of such a long poem should be determined by such small, apparently unimportant words. However, see the observations on the ‘standard’ strophe 4,17–19 in anal. 3.6 above.

[10] Cf. part VI, 2.3 below.

fermata at the end of the second canto; cf. 24,25 (note *w'm l' 'pw my*).

A consideration of the length of the cantos in this poem reveals a balanced, concentric pattern: a central unit with twelve lines (vv. 13–24) is enclosed by units of eleven lines (vv. 2–12 and 25–35). The symmetrical aspect of this framework is carried on in the strophic structure of cantos I and III: 3.3.3.2–2.3.3.3 (see below) and in the structure of the pivotal canto. Canto II (vv. 13–24) divides into two identical canticles of six lines each: vv. 13–18 and 19–24. Verses 13 and 19 introduce these canticles with a statement about God's omnipotence; see anal. 8.2. Formally seen, the delimitation of the canticles is sustained by a fine pattern of external, repetitive parallelisms. In the last lines of both canticles we meet the root *ntn* ('to give') as the the second verb (anal. 8.4.4). The canticles themselves are marked by inclusio. In canticle II.1 the third word of the first and the last line is a hiph'il of the root *šwb* ('to turn back'). In canticle II.2 the inclusio is achieved by the repetition of the root *špṭ* ('to judge') in the second colon of vv. 19 and 24; see also *my* ('who') in anal. 8.4.3. The canticles are furthermore marked as relatively individual sections by linear patterns of responsions; see for canticle II.1, e.g., *ky* and *'šr*, and for canticle II.2, e.g., *rš'* and *hw'*. These external, repetitive parallelisms also support the strophic structure of the canticles (see below).

The poetic device of inclusio not only delimits canticles II.1 and II.2 (and the poem as a whole!), but determines the dimensions of the first canto as well; see *mh* in the second colon of the first and last lines (vv. 2b and 12b). This formal device, however, is only an aspect of a phenomenon which is much more fundamental to the framework of canto I: inclusio in this unit, namely, is also a matter of ideas. The central verses of canto I (vv. 5–10) describe God's power in nature and in the preceding and following lines (vv. 2–4 and 11–12) this power is contrasted by the powerlessness of mankind in general.

As to the framework of the first canto, advocates of strophic structure generally agree that we are dealing with strophes of three lines.[11] The final strophe of the canto only encompasses two lines. See for the three-line strophes of this canto especially anal. 8.2 and 8.4.4. The second canto is exclusively made up of two-line strophes; see for the correct delimitation of these strophes Duhm, Ball, Irwin, De Wilde in anal. 8.5. This regular structure is especially indicated by the *linear* responsions as described in anal. 8.4.3; note *ky*, *'šr*, *'tḥnn*/*ḥnm*, *rš'* and *hw'* (cf. about the structure of the canticles above). From a thematic point of view, the canticles in this second canto display an a.b.b'.a' pattern each; cf. anal. 8.2. The first strophes (vv. 13–14 and 19–20) contain two themes. Vv. 13 and 19 deal with God's power (a). Vv. 14 and 20 contain a statement about Job's weakness and innocence respectively (b). These second themes are elaborated in the following lines, vv. 15–16 and 21–22 respectively (b'). The statements about God's power are elaborated in the final strophes (a'). This double a.b.b'.a' pattern constitutes an external parallelism between the canticles and mutually reinforces their strophic structure. The third canto is again dominated by three-line strophes. Vv. 25–26 form the only exception to this regularity. This deviation, however, exactly fits the symmetric overall-structure of the poem; see the strophic structure of canto I (note vv. 11–12). From a formal point of view the strophic structure of canto III is especially determined by *linear* verbal repetitions; see, e.g., *'m* and *'nky* and note also *ky l'* (anal. 8.4.4). This observation is corroborated by the linear thought progression within canto III. The three-line strophes each time close with a line which can be taken as the climax of the strophes in question; see anal. 8.2. Note also *'nky* in analy̆ses 8.3.2.1.[12]

---

[11] See Köster, Schlottmann, Merx, Delitzsch, Wright, Dillmann, Ley, Vetter, Peters, Skehan, Terrien, Horst, Murphy, Webster in anal. 8.5.

Only after this rhetorical analysis can we attempt to describe in some general terms the flow of the contents of the poem as a whole. As in ch. 7 (cf. also 3,20–23), Job starts to speak in this poem about the position of mankind in general; note *'nwš* in v. 2b (cf. 7,1 and 17). In v. 11 he incidentally records his own 'experience', but the interrogative sentences in v. 12 again refer to mankind in general. And only from v. 14 onwards attention is fully drawn to Job himself (interrupted again by v. 19). So from this viewpoint we are in the dark about the correct place of transition from the first to the second canto.[13] Nevertheless, Schlottmann aptly noted: 'mit V.12 schliesst der erste Gedankenkreis des Kapitels vollkommen ab, wärend alles Folgende von V.13 ausgeht' (p. 264). The first canto focusses on God's exalted power. This theme is summarized in the first line of canto II (and resumed anew in in v. 19): v. 13a corresponds to vv. 5–7 (God's destructive power) and v. 13b corresponds to vv. 8–10 (God's creative power). From that point onwards this impressive power is elaborated for Job's special situation. Canticle II.1 elaborates the theme of v. 3: it is impossible for a human being to answer God; note *'nh* in vv. 3b and 14–16. Canticle II.2 introduces the theme of Job's guiltlessness; note *tm* in vv. 20–22. The third canto, finally, stresses Job's littleness in the light of the all-powerful God of cantos I–II.[14] The canto ends with Job's declaration that he has nothing to fear in a fair trial (v. 35). With this declaration the canto ties in with II.2, where Job stresses his innocence. On the basis of this outcome, the rhetorical framework of the poem can best be compared with a spiral. Taking the composition as a whole there is a linear development of ideas. From the perspective of the inner logic we can observe a complementary phenomenon. In the successive main units the poet each time elaborates a theme which can already be found in the preceding main unit, or he carries this theme to its climax.

---

[12] There is some tradition among advocates of strophic structure to divide this canto into vv. 25–28, 29–31 and 32–35; so Schlottmann, Dillmann, (Skehan), Fohrer, Murphy, Webster (note the concentric pattern 4.3.4). This division, however, does no justice to the rhetorical framework of the canto, which is constituted by a formal and semantic parallelism of the successive strophes. And what is more, the division also fails to appreciate the symmetric macrostructure of the poem. For the correct delimitation see Terrien in anal. 8.5.

[13] According to Epping-Nelis vv. 11–12 form a transition.

The *main theme* of the poem is formulated at both ends of the composition, namely in its first and last line: 'surely, how can a man be just before God' (v. 2b) and 'I would speak and not fear him' (v. 35a); cf. the inclusio by *ky* (...) *kn*. Both cola deal with the theme of *righteousness*. *Job* does not fear a legal procedure, because he *is innocent* (vv. 20–22; cf. ch. 6). With this theme Job directly ties in with the preceding speech by Bildad, in which Bildad lectures Job on God's *just* administration (Horst, Habel). Job, on the one hand, goes along with Bildad (v. 2; and Eliphaz—cf. 4,17).[15] On the other hand Job holds on to his innocence (v. 35) and points out, as against Bildad, that the wicked lord it over the world (see v. 24); note *byd* in v. 24a and 8,20b!

---

[14] Cf. the descriptive phrases by MacKenzie: 'God is irresistible in power, therefore in judgment' (vv. 2–12), 'God is arbitrary' (vv. 13–24), 'Job's helplessness' (vv. 25–10,1a). See also the descriptions of the contents by Van Selms: 'Inderdaad, niemand kan het opnemen tegen God' (vv. 2–13; universal), 'Tevergeefs voer ik rechtsgronden tegen God aan' (vv. 14–24; Job's special case), 'Voor een eerlijk geding zou er een scheidsrechter moeten zijn' (vv. 25–35).

[15] See also the corresponding lines 9,10 and 5,9.

9 Job’s first reply to Bildad (2): Job 10

Structure: 2 10.10 > 2 5.5|5.5 > 2 3.2|2.3||3.2|2.3

A	1	*nqṭh npšy bḤYy*	*’‘zbh ‘ly śyḥy*	*’dbrh bmr npšy*
	2	*’mr ’l ’lwh ’l tršy‘ny*	*hwdy‘ny ‘l mh trybny*	
I.1	3	*hṭwb lk* KY *t‘šq*	KY *tm’s ygy‘* KPYK	*w‘*L *‘ṣt* RŠ‘YM
	4	*h‘yny bśr lk*	*’M kR’WT ’nwš TR’H*	*[HWP‘T*
	5	*hkymy ’nwš ymyk*	*’M šnwtyk kymy gbr*	
	6	KY *tbqš l‘WNY*	*wlḤṬ’TY tdrwš*	
	7	‘L *d‘tk* KY *l’* ’RŠ‘	*w’yn m*YDK *mṣyl*	
I.2	8	*ydy*K *‘ṣbwny w*Y‘ŚW*ny*	*yḥd sbyb wtbl‘ny*	
	9	*zkr n’ ky kḥmr* ‘ŚYT̀*ny*	*w’L ‘PR TŠYBny*	
	10	*HL’ kḥlb ttykny*	*wkgbnh tqpy’ny*	
	11	*‘wr wbśr tlbyšny*	*wb‘ṣmwt wgydym tskkny*	
	12	*ḤYYM wḥsd* ‘ŚYT *‘mdy*	*wpqdt*K *šmrh rwḥy*	
II.1	13	*w’lh ṣpnt blbb*K	*yd‘ty ky z’t* ‘MK	
	14	*’M ḤṬ’TY wšmrtny*	*wm‘WNY l’ tnqny*	
	15	*’M rš‘ty ’lly ly*	*wṣdqty l’ ’ś’ r’šy*	*śb‘ qlwn wR’H ‘nyy*
	16	*w’g’h kšḥl tṣwdny*	**wtšb** *ttpl’ by*	
	17	*tḥdš ‘dy*K *ngdy*	*wtrb k‘ś*K *‘mdy*	*ḥlypwt wṣb’* ‘M*y*
II.2	18	*wlmh mrḥm hṣ’tny*	*’gw‘ w‘yn l’* **tr’ny**	
	19	*k’šr l’ hyyty ’hyh*	*mbṭn lqbr ’wbl*	
	20	*HL’ m‘ṭ ymy wḥdl*	*wšyt mmny w’blygh m‘ṭ*	
	21	*bṭrm ’lk wl’ ’ŠWB*	*’L ’RṢ ḥšk wṣlmwt*	
	22	*’rṣ ‘ypth kmw ’pl*	*ṣlmwt wl’ sdrym*	*wTP‘ kmw ’pl*

9.1 Text

V. 8b—*yḥd sbyb*: ‘complete’ (Hartley; cf. Schlottmann, Dillmann, Habel, Michel).

V. 15c—*wr’h*: ‘sated with’, by-form of *rwh* (see Ps. 91,16 and Isa. 53,11; Gordis, Habel Clines).

V. 16a—*w’g’h*: ‘I lift myself up’; see D.M. Stec, *VT* 34 (1984), pp. 367–68 (so also Driver-Gray, Habel, Clines). MT *wyg’h.*

V. 17c—*ḥlypwt wṣb’*: rendering uncertain; hendiadys?

V. 20a–b—*wḥdl wšyt*: ‘let me be. Hold off’; so Q (Pope, Van Selms, Hartley, Clines). K *yḥdl yšyt.*

V. 22: ‘The closing tristich is effective’ (Driver-Gray; see also Michel).

9.2 Content

Job’s address to God: accusation of unjust administration.

A Introduction: Job decides to address his questions and laments to God (vv. 1–2).
I God destroys his own creature.
  I.1 Are You a human being (vv. 3–5) that You attempt to discover sin with an innocent person? (vv. 6–7).
  I.2 How is it possible that you destroy (note vv. 8b and 9b) your own creature? (vv. 8–12).
II Appeal to God to save Job from death.
  II.1 Evidently it has always been Your intention at all costs to pronounce me guilty (vv. 13–17).
  II.2 If only I had expired immediately after I was born (vv. 18–19). Leave me alone in this short lifetime before I arrive at the land of utter darkness (vv. 20–22).

9.3 Transition markers

9.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

9.3.1.1 cohortative: *’‘zbh*, v. 1b
cohortative: *’dbrh*, v. 1c
h- interr., v. 3a; ext. // *h-* interr. in vv. 4a and 5a
h- interr., v. 10a
w- beginning line, v. 13a
z’t, v. 13b
’lh, v. 13a (Clines)
w- beginning line, v. 16a
w- beginning line, v. 18a
lmh, v. 18a
h- interr., v. 20a

9.3.1.2 *rš‘*, v. 3c

9.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

9.3.2.1 *’mr*, v. 2a
’l (prohib.), v. 2a

9.3.2.2 *mh*, v. 2b
’nwš, v. 5a; ext. // *’nwš*, v. 4b

9.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

imperative: *zkr*, v. 9a
n’, v. 9a

9.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

9.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’l* (prep.), vv. 2, 9, 21 (cf. also *’l* [prohib.] in v. 2); *’m*, vv. 4, 5, 14, 15; *’nwš*, vv. 4, 5; *’pl*, v. 22, 22; *’rṣ*, vv. 21, 22
b: *b-*, vv. 1, 1, 11, 13, 16, 21; *bśr*, vv. 4, 11
h: *h-* interr., vv. 3, 4, 5, 10, 20; *hyh*, v. 19, 19
ḥ: *ḥṭ’*, vv. 6, 14; *ḥyh*, vv. 1, 12
y: *-y*, vv. 1 (5×), 6, 6, 12, 12, 14, 15 (3×), 16, 17 (3×); *yd*, vv. 7, 8; *yd‘*, vv. 2, 7, 13; *ywm*, vv. 5 (3×), 20; *yp‘*, vv. 3, 22
k: *k-*, vv. 4, 5, 5, 9, 10, 10, 16, 19, 22, 22; *-k*, vv. 3, 3, 4, 5, 5, 7, 7, 8, 12, 13, 13, 17, 17; *ky*, vv. 3, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13
l: *l-*, vv. 3, 4, 6, 6, 15, 18, 19; *l’*, vv. 7, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
m: *mh*, vv. 2, 18; *-mw*, vv. 22, 22; *mn*, vv. 7, 14, 18, 19, 20; *m‘ṭ*, vv. 20, 20
n: *-ny*, vv. 2 (3×), 8 (3×), 9, 9, 10, 10, 11, 11, 14 (3×), 16, 18, 18, 20
‘: *‘wn*, vv. 6, 14; *‘yn*, vv. 4, 18; *‘l*, vv. 1, 2, 3, 7; *‘m*, vv. 13, 17; *‘md*, vv. 12, 17; *‘śh*, vv. 8, 9, 12
ṣ: *ṣlmwt*, vv. 21, 22
r: *r’h*, vv. 4, 4, 15, 18; *rš‘*, vv. 2, 3, 7, 15
š: *šwb*, vv. 9, 16, 21; *šmr*, vv. 12, 14

9.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 1–2:	*‘l*, vv. 1b.2b
vv. 3–5:	*h-* interr., vv. 3a.4a.5a—exactly linear
	-k, vv. 3a+b.4a.5a+b; note *lk* in vv. 3a en 4a!
	’m, vv. 4b.5b—exactly linear
	’nwš, vv. 4b.5a!
vv. 6–7:	*ky*, vv. 6a.7a
vv. 8–9:	*‘śh*, vv. 8a.9a—linear
vv. 14–15:	*’m*, vv. 14a.15a—exactly linear
	l’, vv. 14b.15b
vv. 18–19:	*l-*, vv. 18a.19b
	l’, vv. 18b.19a

vv. 20–21: *wl’*, vv. 21a.22b!
’rṣ, vv. 21b.22a!
ṣlmwt, vv. 21b.22b!

9.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 3.7, inclusio (I.1): *ky*, vv. 3a+b.7a; see also v. 6a
kpyk/ydk, vv. 3b and 7b resp.
‘l, vv. 3c.7a
rš‘, vv. 3c.7a
-k, vv. 3a+b.7a+b; see also analysis 9.4.2
vv. 8.12, inclusio (I.2): *-k*, vv. 8a.12b
‘śh, vv. 8a.12a; see also v. 9a!
vv. 13.17, inclusio (II.1): *-k*, vv. 13a+b.17a+b
‘m, vv. 13b.17c!; see also *‘md* in v. 17b
vv. 18–22 (II.2): *l’*, vv. 18b+19a.20a+21a+22b

9.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 3–12 (canto I): *h-* interr., vv. 3–5.10a—‘inclusio’
bśr, vv. 4a.11a!—‘inclusio’
-k, vv. 7a+b.8a—concatenatio
l’, vv. 7a.10a—linear
yd, vv. 7b.8a!—concatenatio
vv. 13–22 (canto II): *l-*, vv. 15a.18a+19b—linear
r’h, vv. 15c.18b—linear
šwb, vv. 16b.21a—linear

9.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

The linear arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 1–2.8–12.18–22: *ḥyh*, vv. 1a.12a!—linear
’l (prep.), vv. 2a.9b.21b!; see also *’l* (prohib.) in v. 2a!
mh, vv. 2b.18a!
w’l ‘pr tšybny/’šwb ’l ’rṣ, v. 9b and 21 resp.; see also *’rṣ* in v. 22a
hl’, vv. 10a.20a!—exactly linear

vv. 3–7.13–17: *-k*, vv. 3–7.13+17
rš‘, vv. 3c+7a.15a
’m, vv. 4b+5b.14a+15a!—linear

r’h, vv. 4b (2×).15c—linear
‘wny, vv. 6a.14b! } chiasm
ḥṭ’ty, vv. 6b.14a!
yd‘, vv. 7a.13b

The symmetric arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 3–7.18–22: *h-* interr., vv. 3–5.20a
yp‘, vv. 3c.22c!
hwp‘t/ *‘ypth*, vv. 3c and 22a resp.—alliter.
‘yn, vv. 4a.18b!
ymy, vv. 5 (3×).20a!
cf. also *gbr*/ *qbr* in vv. 5b and 19b resp. —alliter.

vv. 8–12.13–17: *‘mdy* in vv. 12a and 17b!
šmr, vv. 12b.14a!

vv. 1–2.3–7, concatenatio: *rš‘*, vv. 2a.3c+7a
‘l, vv. 1b+2b.3c+7a!
yd‘, vv. 2b.7a

9.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

9.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
-y, *ky* (v. 9, 13), *l-*

9.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*’pl*), *b-*, (*hyh*), *k-*, (*-mw*), *mn*, (*m‘ṭ*), *-ny*

9.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): . . . |1–3.4–7.8–12.13–17.18–22 (. . . |3.4.3×5); cf. Webster (1983)
Stickel (1842): . . . 1–2.3–7|8–12.13–17|18–19.20–22 (. . . 2.5|5.5|2.3); cf. Horst (1968)
Schlottmann (1851): . . . |1–3|4–5.6–7|8–9.10–11.12||13–15.16–17|18–19. 20–22 (. . . |3|2.2|2.2.1||3.2|2.3)
Ewald (1854): . . . 9,34–10,1|2–7.8–12.13–17.18–22
Merx (1871): . . . 1–3.4–7.8–11.12–15b|15c–17.(18–19).20–22 (. . . 4×8| 6.(4).6)

Hitzig (1874): ...|1–12.13–17.18–22 (...|12.5.5)
Delitzsch (1876): ...|9,34–10,2.3–7.8–12.13–17.18–22 (...|9.11.10.12.11)
Wright (1883): ...|1–3.4–7.8–11|12–15b.15c–17b.17c–19.20–22 (...|3×8|8.5.5.7)
Dillmann (1891): ...||1–3.4–7.8–12|13–17.18–22 (...||8.8.10|12[=7.5].11[=6.5])
Bickell (1894): ...1a–b+2.3a–b+4b+5b.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15b.16+17b–c.18–19.20–21
Ley (1895): 1–3.4–7.8–12.13–17.18–22 (4.4.3×5)
Duhm (1897): ...|1a–b+2.3a–b+4.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15b.16b–17.18–19.20–21
Hontheim (1904): ...||9,34–10,2||3–7.8–12|13–17.18–22 (...||4||10.10)
Schlögl (1916): 1–11.12–22 (22.22)
Ball (1922): ...1–2.3a–b+4.6–7.8+10.11–12.13–14.15a–b+16b–17a.18–19.20–21
Peters (1928): ...|1–2a.2b–3.4–5.6–7.8–9|10–12.13–15.16–17.18–19.20–22 (...|5×2|3.3.2.2.3)
König (1929): ...1–7.8–17.18–22; cf. Stickel (1842)
Kissane (1939): ...2–7*.3+8–12.13–17.18–22 (4×6)
Irwin (1946): ...|2–3.4–5.6–7|8–9.10–11.12–13|14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21 ('couplets')
Möller (1955): 9,25–34.35–10,12.13–22 (10.13.10)
Skehan (1961): ...||1b–2.3–7.8–12.13–17.18–22 (...||2.4×5); cf. Epping-Nelis (1968) and Murphy (1981)
Fohrer (1963): ...|1–2.3–7.8–12.13–17.18–22 (...|3.4×5)
Terrien (1963): ...|1–3.4–6||7–9.10–12|13–15.16–17|18–19.20–22
Horst (1968): 1–7|8–12.13–17|18–22 (7.3×5); cf. Vetter (1897) and Hartley (1988)
TOB (1978): 1–3.4–7.8–9.10–12|13–17.18–19.20–22
KBS (1980): 1–2.3–7.8–12.13–17.18–22
De Wilde (1981): ...1*.2–3b.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–22 (however, see also pp. 152–53)
Van Selms (1982): ...1–12.13–22
Habel (1985): ...|1.2–7.8–17|18–22
Bezuidenhout (1986): ...||1–2.3–5.6–7|8–9.10–12|13–15.16–17|18–19.20–22
Michel (1987): 1–3.4–7.8–9.10–13.14–17.18–19.20–22
Clines (1989): ...1–2.3–7.8–17.18–22 (...2.5.10[=5.5].5)
MacKenzie (1990): ...|1b–2.3–7.8–12|13–17.18-22 (...|2.5.5|5.5); cf. Skehan (1961)

9.6 Comments and summary

Strictly speaking, it is obvious that on the basis of the thought-content ch. 10 from v. 8 onwards can be divided into three proportional sections of five poetic lines each: vv. 8–12, 13–17, 18–22; see anal. 9.2.[1] However, the question is in what way the first seven masoretic verses of this poem conform to the regularity of these five-line sections. Some scholars regard vv. 1–7 as a close unit (so König and Horst). Others assume a short introduction which is followed by a longer ‘strophe’: e.g., vv. 1–2, 3–7 (Stickel, Skehan, Fohrer, KBS, Clines; cf. Delitzsch and Hontheim) or vv. 1–3, 4–7 (Köster, Schlottmann, Merx, Ley, TOB, Michel). In v. 2a Job refers to God in the third person (‘I will say to God’), but immediately switches over to direct speech (‘do not condemn me’). In terms of content it is not explicit at what stage of the speech Job addresses himself directly to God. The analysis of the verbal repetitions, however, demonstrates that we are dealing with a short introduction (vv. 1–2), followed by a unit of again five lines (vv. 3–7).

The main argument in favour of this opinion derives from the stylistic device of inclusio. Just as in the first part of this speech of Job (ch. 9) this device plays an important part on the level of the rhetorical overall structure of the poem. The device delimits most of the five-line units of chapter 10, namely the first three of them (vv. 3–7, 8–12 and 13–17), and the main body of this poem as well! Verses 3–7 are marked by the repetition of four words in the first and the last line: *ky* (’that’), the preposition *‘l* and the root *rš‘* (’to be guilty’); see also *kpyk* (’thy hands’), *ydk* (’thy hand’) in vv. 3b and 7b respectively; see anal. 9.4.3. The root *‘śh* (’to make’) and the suffix *-k* (‘thy’) form an inclusio around the second five-line unit, vv. 8–12 (anal. 9.4.3). Ley (p. 652) pointed out that the unit of vv. 8–12 is also indicated by rhyme: see the suffix 1 sing. *-ny* at the end of the cola (!) of vv. 8–11 and *-y* at the end of the cola of v. 12.[2] In vv. 13–17 we come across another fine specimen of inclusio. The first and the last line of this section close with the preposition *‘m* (’with’); see *‘mk* and *‘my* in vv. 13b and 17c respectively. Furthermore, the repetition of the suffix *-k* in both lines constitutes an internal parallellism (anal. 9.4.3). Because the poet established the five-line structure of his composition already quite clearly as described above, there was obviously no need for him to delimit vv. 18–22 in a similar way. However, the verses concerned are determined as a separate unit by the repetition of the negation *l’* (anal. 9.4.3).

---

[1] So Köster, Schlottmann, Ewald, Ley, Hontheim, Skehan, Fohrer, Horst; cf. also Delitzsch, Dillmann and Kissane (see anal. 9.5). Vv. 15, 17 and 22 are tricola.

[2] Similarly Hontheim, p. 131; cf. Stevenson (1948), pp. 61 and 100.

The introductory function of the first two masoretic verses (vv. 1–2)[3] is further sufficiently clear from the repetition of the root *yp‘* hiph‘il ('to shine'). This root encloses all of the five-line units of this poem; see *hwp‘t* in the third (!) colon of v. 3 and *wtp‘* in the third (!) colon of v. 22; see anal. 9.4.5.[4]

The device of inclusio is so fundamentally integrated into the skeleton of this composition, that the striking phenomena of concatenatio do not harm the regular structure of the successive five-line units; see *-k* and *yd* in anal. 9.4.4, and the concatenatio between vv. 1–2 and 3–7 (anal. 9.4.5).

With regard to the train of thought within the main body of the poem we can now ascertain a repeated, *linear* development. In vv. 13–17 Job accuses God of deliberately trying to find fault with him. With this thought the poet reverts to an important element in vv. 3–7; see especially vv. 6–7. An inspection of the verbal repetitions between vv. 3–7 and 13–17 (the first and third five-line units) indicates an intentional correspondence, too. See especially the root *rš‘* ('to be guilty') and the chiasm *‘wn* ('iniquity')—*ḥṭ’* ('to sin') in anal. 9.4.5. In the second and fourth five-line units (vv. 8–12 and 18–22) the poet also expresses corresponding ideas. In both units Job speaks about himself as a creature (in vv. 18–22 about birth and death in particular). Note also *hl’* at the beginning of the third lines (vv. 10 and 20), and *’l ‘pr tšybny/ ’šwb ’l ’rṣ* in vv. 9b and 21 resp. (anal. 9.4.5). The formal and semantic connections between the five-line units of the poem create a linear, external parallelism. On the basis of this parallelism I conclude that we are dealing with two cantos of ten lines, vv. 3–12 and 13–22 (so also Hontheim; cf. Schlottmann, Dillmann, Möller, TOB, Van Selms and MacKenzie—see anal. 9.5). The five-line units represent the canticles.[5] The symmetrical arrangement of the cantos, as described in anal. 9.4.5, has no thematic correspondence, as far as I can see.[6]

The strophic structure of the canticles is especially supported by the transition markers, which are described in anal. 9.3.1.1 and the external, repetitive parallelism within the strophes (see anal. 9.4.2). The three-line and two-line strophes form a symmetrical pattern in both cantos (3.2–2.3); see for this structure in canto II also Peters and Terrien (anal. 9.5).

---

[3] See for the special character of this strophe part VI, 1.2.6.

[4] Beyond ch. 10, we only come across this root in the book of Job in 3,4 and 37,15.

[5] Scholars like Stickel, König, Weiser, Horst, Habel and Clines take vv. 8–17 (the second and the third 5-line unit) as a relatively self-contained unit. The verses concerned 'befassen sich mit dem vermeintlichen Widerspruch, der sich von dem Schöpfungsglauben her ihm (Hiob) in seinem Leiden ergibt' (Weiser; so also Clines—cf. König). Horst correctly points out that vv. 8–17 extensively develop the idea of v. 3 that God destroys his own creature (pp. 143–44). However, the division under discussion does no justice to the relationship between vv. 8–12 and 18–22, which is much more fundamental.

[6] Note the obvious similarity between the rhetorical structure of chs. 10 and 4 (see anal. 3.6 above): five-line canticles; linear parallelism between the cantos (formal and semantic); symmetric parallelism on the level of the poem as a whole (only formal).

The *quintessential idea* of this part of Job's speech we find in the opening and closing lines of the main body of the poem, especially in the third cola of these lines vv. 3c and 22c. These cola contain a bold accusation by Job: God's light *shines* upon the wicked (cf. 9,24), but darkness *shines* upon his creature Job (although he is guiltless). In this way Job charges God with *unjust administration.* This interpretation is supported by the inclusio around the five-line units; see *ypʿ* and cf. the similar construction in ch. 9! The inclusio even intensifies the accusing character of the poem.[7]

The rhetorical analysis of chs. 9–10 shows that the poetic framework of ch. 10 is quite different from that of the preceding chapter 9. The symmetrical structure of ch. 9 (11|6.6|11) is not organically connected with the structure 2 10.10 of ch. 10. In the latter poem the ten-line cantos exhibit to a large extent linear, external parallelism. The different inclusions which are formed by the repetition of *ky* (. . .) *kn* (ch. 9) and *ypʿ* hiphʿil (ch. 10) also emphasize the relative independence of both poems. Next, in ch. 9 the word *'lwh* (v. 13) functions as part of a responsio on the level of the cantos; in ch. 10, however, the word *'lwh* has lost this function (see 10,2a). Lastly, the break between the chapters is marked by the introduction to the second part of this speech (10,1–2). At the same time, however, this introduction contains the formal link between the two poems; see *'dbrh* ('I will speak') in 10,1c and 9,35a—concatenatio. Note in this context also the function of the root *ršʿ* as part of the formal skeleton of 9,19–24 and 10,3–7.[8]

---

[7] From this perspective it is astonishing to note, that some critics have taken v. 3c as a gloss; so Bickell, Duhm, Ball, Hölscher, and recently De Wilde. Fohrer correctly characterizes this chapter as an 'Anklage gegen Gott' (p. 201). According to Clines the tonality of the speech is 'probably despairing' (p. 225), and 'no closer form-critical classification than "address" is possible' (p. 244); cf. Hartley, who characterizes ch. 10 as a 'lament'.

[8] See further *'ʿzbh* in 10,1b and 9,27b, *śyḥy* in 10,1b and 9,27a, *ṭwb*(*h*) in 10,3a and 9,25b, *'nwš* in 10,4–5 and 9,2b, *ʿmdy* in 10,12a.17b and 9,35b, *l' tnqny* ('you will not acquit me') in 10,14b and 9,28b, *w'blygh* in 10,20b and 9,27b (cf. Ps. 39,14 and Amos 5,9†).

10 Zophar’s first speech: Job 11

Structure: 6.6.6.2 > 3.3|3.3|3.3|2

I	[2]	*HRB* **dbrym** *l’ y‘nh*	*w’M ’yš* **śptym** *yṣdq*	
	[3]	*bdyk mtym yḥryšw*	*wtl‘g W’YN Mklm*	
	[4]	*wt’mr zk lqḥy*	*wbr hyyty b‘YNYk*	
	[5]	*w’wlm MY ytn ’lwh* **dbr**	*wyptḥ* **śpty***w* *‘mk*	
	[6]	*wygd lk t‘lmwt ḥkmh*	*KY lw twšyh*	
		WD‘ KY kplym yšh lk	*’lwh m‘wnk*	
II	[7]	*Hḥqr ’lwh tmṣ’*	*’M ‘d TKLYT šdy tmṣ’*	
	[8]	*gbhy šmym mh tp‘l*	*‘mqh mš’wl mh* **td‘**	
	[9]	*’rkh m’rṣ mdh*	*wrḥbh mny ym*	
	[10]	**’m** *yḥlp wysgyr*	*wyqhyl wMY yšybnw*	
	[11]	*KY hw’ YD‘ mty šw’*	*wyr’ ’wn wl’ ytbwnn*	
	[12]	*W’yš nbwb ylbb*	*w‘yr pr’ ’dm ywld*	
III	[13]	*’M* **’th** *hkynwt lbk*	*wprśt ’lyw kpk*	
	[14]	*’M ’wn bydk hrḥyqhw*	*w’l tškn b’hlyk ‘wlh*	
	[15]	*ky ’z tś’ PNYK mmwm*	*whyyt mṣq wl’ tyr’*	
	[16]	*KY* **’th** *‘ml tškḥ*	*kmym ‘brw tzkr*	
	[17]	*wmṣhrym yqwm ḥld*	*t‘ph kbqr thyh*	
	[18]	*Wbṭḥt KY yš tqwh*	*wḥprt lbṭḥ tškb*	
IV	[19]	*wrbṣt W’YN Mḥryd*	*wḥlw PNYK RBYM*	
	[20]	*W‘YNY rš‘ym TKLYNH*	*wmnws ’bd mnhm*	*wtqwtm mpḥ npš*

10.1 Text

V. 6: According to Slotki the difficulties in this verse would disappear if *kplym* (‘double [punishment]’) in MT is transposed so as to follow the second *ky*, and *lw twšyh* (‘sound wisdom is his’) is read for MT *ltwšyh*, with reference to Job 12,16 and Isa. 40,2; J.J. Slotki, ‘Job xi 6’, *VT* 35 (1985), pp. 229–30. MT as it stands produces a bicolon and—from *wd‘* onwards—a monocolon (so correctly Driver-Gray). Because a monocolon does not occur anywhere else in the book of Job and the emendation of Slotki produces in fact two bicola—cf. Dillmann (1891)—his proposal is very attractive.

V. 12: the meaning of this verse is rather obscure; I adopt MT as it stands (with Driver-Gray, Horst, and Habel).

V. 17b—*t‘ph*: read as a nomen the meaning is ‘darkness’ (Horst, Habel, Clines).

V. 18b—*wḥprt*: ‘(du) kannst Ausschau halten’ (Horst; cf. Habel and Hartley); ‘you will make your couch’ (Gordis); ‘and you will dig a well’ (Michel); ‘you will be protected’ (De Wilde, Clines; cf. BHS).

V. 19a: according to Ehrlich, Duhm, Hölscher, Fohrer and Van Selms an explanatory gloss, with reference to Isa. 17,2 and Zeph. 3,13. Horst connects this colon with v. 18; the tricolon vv. 18–19a in his view would close the third main part (cf. Skehan and De Wilde). However, MT makes good sense in the macrostructure of the poem; see *w’yn m-* in anal. 10.4.4.

10.2 Content

Zophar defends God by lecturing Job on God’s just administration.

- I Job’s transgressions.
  - That absurd talk about your *purity* before God cannot remain uncontradicted (vv. 2–4; Job’s foolishness).
  - If God was to communicate to you something of his wisdom you would know that He exacts double (punishment) for your *iniquity* (vv. 5–6).
- II God’s wisdom and power.
  - God’s secrets are unfathomable (vv. 7–9; God’s wisdom—cf. vv. 2–4).
  - The *sinners* surely do not remain hidden for God (vv. 10–12; cf. vv. 5–6).
- III Appeal to repentance.
  - If you turn to God in prayer you will be *free from blemish* before God (vv. 13–15; cf. vv. 2–4).
  - Then, you are heading for a wonderful future (vv. 16–18).
- IV Summary: You will live in peace, but the wicked will decay (vv. 19–20).

10.3 Transition markers

10.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

10.3.1.1 *h-* interr., v. 2a
w- beginn. line, v. 5a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in v. 6a and c
’wlm, v. 5a (Clines)
my ytn, v. 5a
h- interr., v. 7a
my, v. 10b
’th, v. 13a
’th, v. 16a
w- beginn. line, v. 19a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in v. 20a

10.3.1.2 no remarks

10.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

10.3.2.1 *’mr*, v. 4a
tqwh, v. 18a
rš‘, v. 20a
tqwh, v. 20c

10.3.2.2 *w-* beginning line, v. 4a
imperative: *d‘*, v. 6c
w- beginning line, v. 12a
’z, v. 15a
w- beginn. line, v. 18a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in v. 17a

10.3.3 Contrary indications

ḥrš, v. 3a
mh, v. 8a
mh, v. 8b

hw’, v. 11a
imperat.: *hrḥyqhw*, v. 14a
’l (prohib.), v. 14b

10.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

10.4.1 General survey

’: *’wn*, vv. 11, 14; *’yn*, vv. 3, 19; *’yš*, vv. 2, 12; *’lwh*, vv. 5, 6, 7; *’m*, vv. 2, 7, 10, 13, 14; *’th*, vv. 13, 16

b: *b-*, vv. 4, 14, 14; *bṭḥ*, vv. 18, 18

d: *dbr*, vv. 2, 5

h: *h-* interr., vv. 2, 7; *hyh*, vv. 4, 15, 17; *-hw*, vv. 10, 14

w: *-w*, vv. 5, 6*, 13

y: *yd‘*, vv. 6, 8, 11

k: *k-*, vv. 16, 17; *-k*, vv. 3, 4, 5, 6 (3×), 13, 13, 14, 14, 15, 19; *ky*, vv. 6, 6, 11, 15, 16, 18; *klh*, vv. 7, 20

l: *l-*, vv. 6 (3×), 18; *l’*, vv. 2, 11, 15; *lbb*, vv. 12, 13

m: *mh*, vv. 8, 8; *my*, vv. 5, 10; *mn*, vv. 6, 8, 9, 9 (*mny*), 15, 17, 20; *mṣ’*, vv. 7, 7; *mtym*, vv. 3, 11

‘: *‘yn*, vv. 4, 20

p: *pnh*, vv. 15, 19

q: *qwh*, vv. 18, 20

r: *rbh*, vv. 2, 19

ś: *śph*, vv. 2, 5

10.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–4: *hrb dbrym/wbr*, vv. 2a and 4b resp. (alliteration)—inclusio
vv. 5–6: *'lwh*, vv. 5a.6d—inclusio
-w, vv. 5b.6b*
lk, vv. 6a.6c!
ky, vv. 6b.6c
vv. 7–9: *mn*, vv. 8b.9a+b
vv. 10–12: *ytbwnn/nbwb*, vv. 11b and 12a resp.—alliteration
vv. 13–15: *'m*, vv. 13a.14a—exactly linear (anaphora; Hontheim, p. 136)
-k, vv. 13a+b.14a+b.15a
'l (prep.)/*'l* (prohib.), vv. 13b and 14b resp.!
kp/yd, vv. 13b and 14a respectively!
vv. 16–18: *ky*, vv. 16a.18a—inclusio
tškḥ/tškb, vv. 16a and 18b resp. (alliteration)—inclusio
k-, vv. 16b.17b!

10.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–6 (canto I): *dbr*, vv. 2a.5a!—linear
śptym, vv. 2b.5b!—linear
w- beginning line, vv. 4a.5a—concatenatio

vv. 7–12 (canto II): *'m*, vv. 7b.10a—linear
mš'wl/mty šw', vv. 8b and 11a resp. (alliter.) —linear
yd', vv. 8b.11a—linear
'rṣ/'dm, vv. 9a.12b!—linear

vv. 13–18 (canto III): *'th*, vv. 13a.16a!—exactly linear
ky, vv. 15a.16a—concatenatio; see also *ky* in v. 18a
hyh, vv. 15b.17b

10.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–4.7–9.13–15.19–20: *h-* interr., vv. 2a.7a!—exactly linear
rbh, vv. 2a.19b!—linear
'm, vv. 2b.7b.13a+14a—linear
w'yn followed by a part. hiph'il, vv. 3b.19a!
zk ... br/mmwm, vv. 4 and 15a resp.! —exactly linear

hyyty/hyyt, vv. 4b and 15b resp.—linear
b-, vv. 4b.14a+b!
‘ynym, vv. 4b.20a!
tklyt/tklynh, vv. 7b and 20a! resp.
pnyk, vv. 15a.19b!
wl’ tyr’/w’yn mḥryd, vv. 15b and 19a resp. }
chiasm (Fokkelman)

vv. 5–6.10–12.16–18: *my*, vv. 5a.10b!—linear
l-, vv. 6a+b+c.18b!—linear
t‘lmwt/’th ‘ml, vv. 6a and 16a resp.—alliter.
ky, vv. 6b+c.11a.16a+18a
w- beginn. line, vv. 6c.12a.18a—exactly linear
yšh/’yš/yš, vv. 6c, 12a and 18a resp. (alliter.) —linear; see, however, also *’yš* in v. 2b
yd‘, vv. 6c.11a; see also *byn* hitpa‘el in v. 11b!

vv. 5–6.7–9, concatenatio: *’lwh*, vv. 5a+6d.7a!; see also *šdy* in v. 7b!
vv. 10–12.13–15, concatenatio: *’wn*, vv. 11b.14a!
lbb, vv. 12a.13a!
vv. 16–18.19–20, concatenatio: *w-* beginning line, vv. 17+18.19+20
qwh, vv. 18a.20c

10.4.5 Remaining verbal repetitions

10.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration

-k, *mn*

10.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration

’yš, (*bṭḥ*), *-hw*, *l’*, (*mh*), (*mṣ’*), *mtym*

10.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–6.7–12.13–19.20 (5.6.7.1)
Stickel (1842): 2–6|7–9.10–12.13-15|16–20 (5|3×3|5)
Schlottmann (1851): 2.3–4.5–6||7–9.10–12||13–15|16–17.18–19.20 (1.2.2|| 3.3||3|2.2.1)
Ewald (1854): 2–6|7–12|13–16.17–20; cf. König (1929) and TOB (1978)
Merx (1871): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–12.13–15|16–18.19–20 (6.6|3×6|6.6); cf. Stickel (1842)

Hitzig (1874): 2–11.12.13–20 (10.1.8)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–20 (11.3×6.11); cf. Stickel (1842)
Wright (1883): 2–4.5–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–18.19–20 (6×6.5)
Dillmann (1891): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–12|13–15.16–18.19–20 (6.6|6.6|6.6.5)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.5–6b.8–9.11–12.13+15.16–17.18–19.20*
Ley (1895): 2–4.5–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–18.19–20 (7×3)
Duhm (1897): 2–3.7+4.5–6b.8–9.11–12|13–14.15–16.17–18.19b–20
Vetter (1897): 2–4|5–6.7–9|10–12.13–14.15–16.17–19 (20)
Hontheim (1904): 2–4.5–6|7–12|13–16.17–20 (3.3|6|4.4)
Schlögl (1916): 2–10.11–18+19b–20 (20.20)
Ball (1922): 2–3.5–6b.8–9.11–12.13–14.16–17.18–19.20*; cf. Bickell (1894)
Peters (1928): 2–3.4–5.6.7–9.10–12|13–14.15–16.17–19.20 (2.2.2.3.3|2.2.3.1)
Kissane (1939): 2–6.7–9+12,22+11,10.11–15.16–20 (4×5)
Irwin (1946): 2–4.5–6.7–9.10–12|13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20 (4×3|4×2)
Möller (1955): 2–4.5–12.13–20 (3.8.8); cf. Hartley (1988)
Skehan (1961): 2–6.7–12.13–19a.19b–20 (3×6.2); cf. Murphy (1981)
Fohrer (1963): 2–4.5–6.7–9.10–12|13–16.17–18+19b+20 (4×3|4.4)
Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–12|13–15.16–18.19–20
Horst (1968): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–12|13–19a.19b–20 (3.3|3.3|6.2); cf. Epping-Nelis (1968)
KBS (1980): 2–6.7–11.12.13–16.17–18.19–20; cf. Hitzig (1874)
De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.6a–b+7.8–9|10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.6c+18–19a.19b–20
Van Selms (1982): 2–12.13–20; similarly Kroeze (1961)
Webster (1983): 2–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–19 (20)
Habel (1985): 2–3.4.5–6b.6c.7–9.10–11.12|13–14.15–19.20 (a.x.b.c.b'.c'.a'|e.f.c")
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–3.4–6|7–9.10–12||13–16.17–20
Michel (1987): 2–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–16.17–19.20; cf. Webster (1983)
Hartley (1988): 2–4.5–12.13–20
Clines (1989): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–12|13–16.17–20 (3.3|3.3|4.4); cf. Hontheim (1904) and Fohrer (1963)
MacKenzie (1990): 2–6.7–12|13–19a.19b–20 (6.6|6.2); cf. Skehan (1961)

10.6 Comments and summary

Some scholars think that in ch. 11 we are dealing with two major parts: vv. 2–12 and 13–20.[1] The development of the thought within the poem seems to corroborate this view: indicting disputation (vv. 2–12), conditional assurance (vv. 13–20)—so Habel. Cf. with these descriptive phrases, however, those by Van Selms: 'Geen mens kan Gods geheimen doorgronden' (vv. 2–12), 'het gebed van een rechtvaardige vermag veel' (vv. 13–20). That is to say, as to the content of vv. 2–12 Habel stresses the aspect of Job's sins (see vv. 6 and 11), and Van Selms the aspect of God's wisdom (see especially vv. 7–9). Hence, others discern in ch. 11 a tripartite structure: vv. 2–6 ('Crimes de Job'), 7–12 ('Justice de Dieu') and 13–20 ('Vie nouvelle').[2]

---

[1] Duhm, Peters, Irwin, Fohrer, Van Selms, Habel, MacKenzie; see anal. 10.5.

The latter division does more justice to the different themes within vv. 2–12 and also fits the formal framework of the composition better. The formal devices, however, support yet another main break, namely after v. 18.[3] The poem as a whole is composed of three identical cantos of six lines each, and is closed by a two-line strophe, which—from a formal point of view—has to be taken as an individual canto too. This regular framework the poet univocally laid down in his composition by a pattern of verbal repetitions that is carried out throughout the poem. The break between the first two cantos (vv. 2–6 and 7–12) is especially indicated by the verbal repetitions of *h-* interrogative just at the beginning of these cantos and the copula *w-* just at the beginning of the last line of the cantos; see also *'m* in anal. 10.4.4. The particle *'m* also marks the beginning of the third canto. The second canto is concluded by the proverb-saying (Habel, Clines) of v. 12.[4] When we compare v. 18 with the last lines of cantos I and II our attention is drawn to yet other responsions; see *ky* and the alliteration *yšh/'yš/yš* in anal. 10.4.4. Vv. 19–20 as a two-line strophe (canto) stand outside the regular six-line canto structure of the poem. At the same time, from the point of view of the verbal responsions this final strophe obviously forms an integral part of the composition. See especially the repetitive, verbal parallelism between vv. 19–20 and 2–4: *rbh*, *w'yn*, *'ynym*; but also *klh* and *pnyk* in anal. 10.4.4. These verbal repetitions establish conclusive proof that vv. 19–20 form an individual two-line canto at the end of the poem. This strophe functions as a *conclusion*. The concluding character is enhanced by the external, antithetic parallelism between vv. 19 and 20; cf.

---

[2] So Schlottmann, Ewald, Dillmann, Terrien, Horst, TOB, Clines; cf. Köster. The descriptive phrases are TOB's and match those of Clines: 'Zophar reproaches Job for his claim to innocence' (vv. 2–6); 'he affirms the inscrutability of God' (vv. 7–12); 'he counsels Job on the right way to behave' (vv. 13–20).

[3] See Skehan and cf. Terrien, Epping-Nelis, Horst, MacKenzie in anal. 10.5. The choice for the main caesura between vv. 18 and 19 is unfortunately not motivated by Skehan. According to Horst the third main part comes to a kind of rounding off after six lines too.

[4] Cf. 4,10–11. According to Van Selms vv. 2–12 end with 'two general statements' (vv. 11–12).

8,20–22.[5]

The strophic analysis of Zophar's speech shows that each of the six-line cantos is composed of two strophes of three lines.[6] In this context Clines points to the transitionmarker *'wlm* in v. 5 and notes 'a kind of contradiction' between vv. 7–9 and 10–12. From a thematic point of view, however, there is a clear antithesis between vv. 2–4, which portray Job's stupidity (note v. 3), and vv. 7–9, which portray God's wisdom (cf. v. 6a). Furthermore, there is a correspondence between vv. 5–6 and 10–12; both strophes explicitly deal with Job's transgression (note v. 6d and 11b). So, the cantos also form a *semantic*, external parallelism (see anal. 10.2). At the same time, this parallelistic structure supports the strophic divisions in cantos I and II. See further anal. 10.3.1.1, and *dbr*, *śptym*, *'m*, *yd'*, *'rṣ/'dm* in anal. 10.4.3. The parallelistic structure between the cantos is partially carried on in canto III, too. Just like the first strophe of canto I, the first strophe of canto III deals with Job's innocence—see *zk/br* in v. 4 and *mmwm* in v. 15 (cf. anal. 10.4.4). The linear, external parallelism between the notions in question supports my view, that canto III also divides into strophes of three lines; see further *'th* in anal. 10.3.1.1 and 10.4.3, *'z* in anal. 10.3.2.2 and *k-* in anal. 10.4.2.[7]

From a thematic point of view there is no clear break between the third and the fourth canto ('enjambement'); see also anal. 10.4.4. However, this phenomenon is not exclusive for the transition from canto III to canto IV. All the cantos of this poem are thematically and/or formally connected with each other. The word *'lwh* ('God') in vv. 6c and 7a (see also *šdy* in v. 7b) joins both first cantos together—concatenatio. And also in terms of content the transition from the first to the second canto is fluent: 'Die Frage (v. 7) knüpft an 6a an' (Horst).[8] See for the concatenatio between cantos II and III anal. 10.4.4.

The study of the verbal repetitions, finally, also provides us with a sound basis to establish the *quintessential thought* of Zophar's first speech. On the level of the poem as a whole the verbal correspondences between the first and the last strophe (vv. 2–4 and 19–20 resp.) are especially striking. Furthermore, Clines aptly notes in this context that only vv. 10–12 and the concluding v. 20 are not cast in second person address to Job (p. 258). Vv. 10–12 represent the pivotal strophe of the poem. On this basis I conclude that we find the main theme of ch. 11 in the opening and closing lines (cf. Bildad's speech in ch. 8), as well as in the *pivotal colon* of the poem: '*for He knows worthless men*' (v. 11a).[9] With these fundamental statements Zophar straightforwardly turns against Job accusing God of unjust administration of the world in ch. 10 (cf. the speech by Bildad).[10] That this will be the main theme of the poem immmediately comes to light in the first line; see the root *ṣdq* in v. 2b—cf. 9,2 (and 10,15).[11] Zophar reproaches Job for his turning things upside down by maintaining he is more just than God.

---

[5] See further part VI, 1.2.3.

[6] So correctly earlier scholars like Merx, Wright, Dillmann and Ley, but recently also Terrien; cf. Hontheim, Fohrer, Horst and Clines.

[7] As against Hontheim, Fohrer and Clines. The overall structure of this speech (6.6.6.2) is very similar to that of Bildad's speech in ch. 8 (6.6.6.3; see above). Cf. also 11,13–15 with 8,5–7 (note *'m 'th* in 11,13 and 8,5); 'and the eyes of the wicked will fail' (11,20a) with 'and the tent of the wicked will be no more' (8,22b).

[8] In this context, I note too that the noun *'yš* ('man') in vv. 2b and 12a encloses both first cantos.

---

[9] There are 20 cola that precede v. 11a, and also 20 cola that follow this poetic unit. The pivotal function of v. 11a is further supported by the fact that the sum total of the words in each of the sections of 20 cola (vv. 2–10 and 11b–20) is exactly 70; note in this connection anal. 10.1 with v. 6.

[10] See also *‘mk* in 11,5b and 10,13b, *ḥkm* in 11,6a and 9,4a, *my yšybnw* in 11,10b and 9,12a. Note especially the alliteration *t‘ph/‘ypth* in 11,17b and 10,22a resp. There is a counterpoint between Job's portrayal of his future at the end of ch. 10 ('darkness'; note vv. 21b–22) and Zophar's portrayal of Job's future at the end of his third canto ('light'; note v. 17). For other verbal correspondences, especially between 11,13–20 and the preceding speeches of Job, see Habel, pp. 205–06.

[11] According to Clines the '*nodal verses*' are 'evidently' vv. 6c (MT) and 15, and the mood of the speech is fundamentally 'kind'. However, as far as I can see, this conclusion has no relationship with Clines's strophic analysis. In my opinion the tonality is *reprimanding* rather than kind.

11 Job’s first reply to Zophar (1): Job 12

Structure: 12.12 > 5.7|7.5 (a.b|b’.a’) > 2.3|2.2.3||3.2.2|2.3

I.1	[2]	*’mnm ky ’tm ‘M*	*w*‘**mkm** *tmwt* **ḥkmh**	
	[3]	*gm ly LBB Kmwkm*	*l’ npl ’nky mkm*	*w’t my ’yn Kmw ’lh*
	[4]	*śḥq lr‘hw ’hyh*	*qr’ l’lwh wy‘nhw*	*śḥwq ṣdyq tmym*
	[5]	*lpyd BWZ l‘štwt š’nn*	*nkwn lmw‘dy rgl*	
	[6]	*yšlyw ’hlym lšddym*	*wbṭḥwt lmrgyzy ’l*	*l’šr hby’ ’lwh bydw*
I.2	[7]	*w’wlm š’l n’ bhmwt wtrk*	*w‘wp hšmym wygd lk*	
	[8]	*’w śyḥ l’rṣ wtrk*	*wysprw lk dgy hym*	
	[9]	*my l’ yd‘ bkl ’lh*	*ky yd yhwh ‘śth z’t*	
	[10]	*’šr bydw npš kl ḥy*	*wrwḥ kl bśr ’YŠ*	
	[11]	*hl’ ’zn mlyn tbḥn*	*wḥk ’kl YṬ‘M lw*	
	[12]	*byšyšym* **ḥkmh**	*w’rk ymym tbwnh*	
	[13]	*‘MW* **ḥkmh** *wgbwrh*	*LW ‘ṢH wtbwnh*	
II.1	[14]	*hn yhrws* **wl’** *ybnh*	*ysgr* **‘l** *’YŠ* **wl’** *ypth*	
	[15]	*hn y‘ṣr bmym wybšw*	*wyšlḥm wyhpkw* **’rṣ**	
	[16]	*‘MW ‘z wtwšyh*	*LW šgg wmšgh*	
	[17]	MWLYK *YW‘ṢYM* ŠWLL	*wšpṭym yhwll*	
	[18]	*mwsr mlkym ptḥ*	*wy’sr ’zwr bmtnyhm*	
	[19]	MWLYK *khnym* ŠWLL	*w’tnym yslp*	
	[20]	**msyr** *śph ln’mnym*	*wṬ‘M zqnym yqḥ*	
II.2	[21]	*šwpk BWZ* **‘l** *ndybym*	*wmzyḥ ’pyqym rph*	
	[22]	*mglh ‘mqwt mny* ḤŠK	*wyṣ’ l’*WR *ṣlmwt*	
	[23]	*mśgy’ lgwym wy’bdm*	*šṭḥ lgwym wynḥm*	
	[24]	**msyr** *LB r’šy ‘M h*’**rṣ**	*wyt‘m bthw l’ drk*	
	[25]	*ymššw* ḤŠK **wl’** ’WR	*wyt‘m Kškwr*	

11.1 Text

V. 2a—*‘m*: ‘people’; so MT. The second colon can be taken as a relative clause to this noun: ‘with whom wisdom will die’; see J.A. Davies, *VT* 25 (1975), pp. 670–71 (Clines; cf. also anal. 11.4.5). According to Michel—following M. Dahood, *UF* 1 (1969), p. 25 n. 1—the noun means 'sagacity'; cf. *ḥkmh* in v. 2b.

V. 5b—*nkwn*: meaning unclear; 'blow' (so Schultens ['percussio flagellans'], Dhorme, Clines), or 'it is proper/fitting' (Pope).

V. 6c: The singular forms *hby'* and *bydw* are problematic in a context of plurals (see v. 6a–b) and the meaning of this colon is obscure.

V. 11b—*yṭ'm lw*: the preposition *l-* is emphatic; cf. Job 7,3 in anal. 6.1 above. Gordis takes *lw* as an ethical dative, with reference to 5,27 and 13,1.

V. 19a: the variation on v. 17a has a structural purpose; see anal. 11.4.3.

V. 23b—*wynḥm*: 'and He led them'; so MT. The positive meaning of the verb is problematic in the context. Many, therefore, revocalize MT and read 'and He leaves them' (hiph'il of *nwḥ*); but cf. Clines.

V. 24a—*'m*: 'people'; MT is supported by analysis 11.4.5 (see also Habel, Hartley, Clines).

11.2 Content

Job's portrayal of God's unfathomable wisdom.

I The wisdom of the friends cannot account for *Job's misery.*
  I.1 Your wisdom cannot explain God's administration and governance of the world.
    I am not inferior to you (plural) in wisdom (vv. 2–3; direct address—note *'tm* and *-km*).
    Although I am righteous I am ridiculed; God's opponents, however, prosper (vv. 4–6; antithetic formulation).
  I.2 The administration of the world is not as transparent as you preach it to be.
    (You say:) Any creature could tell you (vv. 7–8; singular, direct address—cf. vv. 2–3)
    that it receives breath of life from the LORD (vv. 9–10).
    An advanced age does not warrant wisdom; wisdom is only with Him (vv. 11–13; antithetic formulation—cf. vv. 4–6).
II Portrayal of *God's unfathomable* wisdom and destructive power.
  II.1 God's governance over *life.*
    The natural phenomena are evidences of His destructive power (vv. 14–16).
    He disgraces the leaders of nations (vv. 17–20).
  II.2 God's governance over the *forces of death.*
    He governs the darkness of chaos as well (vv. 21–22).
    Rulers of nations are sent into the darkness of chaos by Him (vv. 23–25).

11.3 Transition markers

11.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

11.3.1.1 *’mnm*, v. 2a
’tm, v. 2a
w- beginning line, v. 7a
’wlm, v. 7a
imperative: *š’l*, v. 7a
n’, v. 7a
my, v. 9a
’lh, v. 9a
z’t, v. 9b
h- interr., v. 11a
emphatic *l*-, v. 11b
hn, v. 14a; ext. // *hn* in v. 15a

11.3.1.2 no remarks

11.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

11.3.2.1 *gm*, v. 3a
’nky, v. 3b

11.3.2.2 no remarks

11.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

my, v. 3c
’lh, v. 3c

11.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

11.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’wr*, vv. 22, 25; *’yš*, vv. 10, 14; *’lh*, vv. 3, 9; *’lwh*, vv. 4, 6 (see also *’l* in v. 6 and *yhwh* in v. 9); *’mn*, vv. 2, 20; *’rṣ*, vv. 8, 15, 24; *’šr*, vv. 6, 10
b: *b*-, vv. 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 24; *bwz*, vv. 5, 21; *byn*, vv. 12, 13
g: *gwy*, vv. 23, 23
h: *h*- (article), vv. 7, 8, 24 (cf. also *h*- interr. in v. 11); -*hw*, vv. 4, 4; *hlk*, vv. 17, 19; *hn*, vv. 14, 15
w: -*w*, vv. 6, 10, 11, 13, 13, 16, 16
ḥ: *ḥkm*, vv. 2, 12, 13; *ḥšk*, vv. 22, 25
ṭ: *ṭ‘m*, vv. 11, 20
y: *yd*, vv. 6, 9, 10; *y‘ṣ*, vv. 13, 17; *yrh*, vv. 7, 8
k: *k*-, vv. 3, 3, 25; -*k*, vv. 7, 7, 8, 8; *ky*, vv. 2, 9; *kl*, vv. 9, 10, 10; -*km*, vv. 2, 3, 3
l: *l*-, vv. 3, 4, 4, 5 (3×), 6 (3×), 7, 8, 8, 11, 13, 16, 20, 22, 23, 23; *l’*, vv. 3, 9, 11, 14, 14, 24, 25; *lbb*, vv. 3, 24
m: -*m*, vv. 15, 23, 23, 24, 25 (see also -*hm* in v. 18); -*mw*, vv. 3, 3; *my*, vv. 3, 9; *mn*, vv. 3, 22 (*mny*)

s: *swr*, vv. 20, 24
‘: *‘l*, vv. 14, 21; *‘m* (‘people’), vv. 2, 24; *‘m* (prep.), vv. 2, 13, 16
p: *pth̩*, vv. 14, 18
ś: *śh̩q*, vv. 4, 4
š: *šll*, vv. 17, 19
t: *t‘h*, vv. 24, 25

11.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *m* sound, vv. 2–3 (cf. Kroeze and Gordis)
-km, vv. 2b.3a+b!
vv. 4–6: *’lwh*, vv. 4b.6c!—inclusio; see also *’l* in v. 6b
vv. 7–8: *w’wlm/’w*, vv. 7a and 8a resp. (alliteration)—linear
wtrk, vv. 7a.8a!—linear
h- (article), vv. 7b.8b
wygd/dgy, vv. 7b and 8b resp.—alliteration
lk, vv. 7b.8b!
vv. 9–10: *b-*, vv. 9a.10a
kl, vv. 9a.10a+b! } chiasm; Ceresko (1975), p. 83
yd, vv. 9b.10a
vv. 11–13: *lw*, vv. 11b.13b—inclusio
h̩kmh, vv. 12a.13a; see also *wh̩k* in v. 11b (alliteration)
tbwnh, vv. 12b.13b!—linear
vv. 14–16: *hn*, vv. 14a.15a!—exactly linear
vv. 23–25: *-m*, vv. 23a+b.24b.25b
wyt‘m, vv. 24b.25b!—exactly linear
l’, vv. 24b.25a

11.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 7–13 (I.2): *l’*, vv. 9a.11a—linear
vv. 14–20 (II.1): *pth̩*, vv. 14b.18a!
mwlyk . . . šwll, vv. 17a.19a!—exactly linear
mwsr/msyr, vv. 18a and 20a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
vv. 21–25 (II.2): *h̩šk*, vv. 22a.25a!—linear
’wr, vv. 22b.25a!—linear

11.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–13 (canto I): *ky*, vv. 2a.9b!
‘m (prep.), vv. 2b.13a—inclusio

ḥkmh, vv. 2b.12a+13a!—inclusio (cf. Swanepoel, p. 193); see also *lbb* in v. 3a
my, vv. 3c.9a!
’lh, vv. 3c.9a!
’lwh . . . ’l . . . ’lwh/yhwh, vv. 4–6 and 9b resp.!
’šr (. . .) *bydw*, vv. 6c.10a!; see also *yd* in v. 9b!

vv. 14–25 (canto II): *wl’*, vv. 14a+b.25a!—inclusio; cf. also *l’* in v. 24b
-m, vv. 15b.23–25!—‘inclusio’; but cf. also *-hm* in v. 18b
’rṣ, vv. 15b.24a—‘inclusio’
šgg wmšgh/mśgy’, vv. 16b and 23a resp. (alliter.) —‘inclusio’
‘l, vv. 14b.21a!—exactly linear
msyr, vv. 20a.24a!—linear
wṭ‘m/wyt‘m, vv. 20b and 24b+25b resp. (alliter.) —exactly linear

11.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–6.21–25: *‘m* (‘people’), vv. 2a.24a!; cf. also *‘m* (prep.) in v. 2b (Bezuidenhout, p. 159; see Swanepoel, p. 192)
lbb, vv. 3a.24a! (Bezuidenhout, p. 159; see Swanepoel, p. 192)
k-, vv. 3a+c.25b!
bwz, vv. 5a.21a!
mn/mny, vv. 3b.22a!

vv. 7–13.14–20: *’rṣ*, vv. 8a.15b
’yš, vv. 10b.14b!
ṭ‘m, vv. 11b.20b!
yšyš/zqn, vv. 12a and 20b respectively
‘mw . . . lw, vv. 13.16!; see also *lw* in v. 11b
y‘ṣ, vv. 13b.17a!; see also *twšyh* in v. 16a (cf. 26,3)

11.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

11.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

b-, *h-* (article, v. 24), *-w*, *l-*, *l’* (v. 3)

11.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

’mn, (*gwy*), (*-hw*), (*-mw*), (*śḥq*)

11.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–6.7–10.11–12.13–16.17–21.22–25|... (5.4.2.4.5.4|...)
Stickel (1842): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–15.16–21|22–25... (2.3.4.5.6|4...)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–3.4-5.6|7–8.9–10.11–13||14–16|17.18–19.20–21| 22–23.24–25||... (5.7|3.5.4|...)
Ewald (1854): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–12*(plus two verses).13–15.16–18.19–21. 22–25|...
Merx (1871): 2–3.4b–6.7–10|11–13.14–16.17–19.20–22.23–25... (4.6.8| 5×6...)
Hitzig (1874): 2–6.7–10.11–13|14–16.17–22.23–25||... (5.4.3|3.6.3||...)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–13.14–16.17–21.22–25|... (5.8.8.6.6.10. 8|...)
Wright (1883): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–12|13–16.17–19.20–22.23–25|... (5.8.8.4| 8.3×6|...)
Dillmann (1891): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–12|13–15.16–18.19–21.22–25||... (5.8.8.4|3×6.8||...)
Bickell (1894): 2–3a+4c.5–6b.7–8.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18a+19b+20. 21–22.24–25...
Ley (1895): 2–6.7–12.13–18.19–25 (4×6)
Duhm (1897): 2–3.[4–6.7–10].11–12.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.[22–23]. 24–25|...
Vetter (1897): 2–3|4–6|7–10|11–12|13–25|...
Hontheim (1904): 2–6|7–12||13–16||17–19|20–22||23–25||... (6.6|4|3.3|3|...)
Schlögl (1916): 2–11.12–22... (22.22...)
Ball (1922): 2–3a+c.4a+c–5.7–8.9–10.11–12.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21. 22–23.24–25...
Peters (1928): 2–3.4–6.7–8.9–10.11–13|14–16.17–19.20–22.23–25|... (2.3.2.2.3|4×3|...)
König (1929): 2–12.13–25...
Kissane (1939): 2–6.7–12.13–15+23–25.16–21|... (5.6.5.6|...)
Möller (1955): 2–13.14–25... (12.12...); similarly Van Selms (1982)
Skehan (1961): 2–6.7–12.13–15+18+21b+19b.16+19a+17b+20+22–23+ 24a+25|... (5.6.5.6|...); cf. Kissane (1939)
Fohrer (1963): 2–3.4–6.[7–11.12–15.16–20.21+23–25]... (2.3...)
Terrien (1963): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16|17–19.20–22.23–25||...
Epping-Nelis (1968): 2–6|7–12|13–15.16–21.22–25...
Horst (1968): 2–3.4–6.[7–10]||11–12.13–15|16–18.19–21.23–25|13,1–2 (2.3.[4]||2.3|3×3|2)
TOB (1978): 2–4.5–6.7–10.11–13|14–25|...
KBS (1980): 2–6.7–16.17–25

De Wilde (1980): 2 3a+c.4.5.6.11.12–13.14–15.16+22.23+17.18–19.20–21.24–25...
Murphy (1981): 2.3.4–6|7–10.11–12|13–25||...
Webster (1983): 2–3.4–6.7–9.10–13.14–16.17–21.22–25
Habel (1985): 2–6|7–12|13–16.17–21.22–25|13,1–5 (a.b.c.a')
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–6.7–10.11–13.14–16|17–21.22–25||... (5.4.3.3|5.4||...)
Michel (1987): 2–3.4–6.7–8.9–11.12–13.14–16.17–19.20–22.23–25
Hartley (1988): 2–3.4–6.7–11|12–25|...
Clines (1989): 2–6.7–12.13–15.16–21.22–25... (5.6.3.6.4... > 3.2|3.3|3|3.3|3.1...)
MacKenzie (1990): 2–6.7–12.13–19.20–25|...
Swanepoel (1991), pp. 196–201: 2–6.7–12|13–16.17–21.22–25

11.6 Comments and summary

By just analysing the directions of address, we might conclude that Job's speech in chs. 12–14 consists of two parts: the part directed to the friends (12,2–13,12) and the part comprising the complaint to God (13,13–14,22).[1] The rhetorical analysis of this speech, however, corroborates the opinion of those scholars who divide it into three sections, the extent of which is again (cf. chs. 4–5, 6–7 and 9–10) exactly indicated by the chapter division.[2] In the first section, according to Horst, we meet Job's 'Stellungnahme zu dem Theologumenon von der irrtumslosen Weisheit Gottes', in the second section 'das immer neu bedrängende Fragen nach dem Grund des ihm begegnenden Feindhandelns Gottes', and in the third section with an 'Elegie und resignierter Klage' (p. 183; cf. Ley, p. 653). As we will see below, each chapter in itself is an independent poem.

The thematic connection with the context of some poetic lines in ch. 12 is not very obvious (see especially vv. 11, 16 and 22). Not without reason does De Wilde call ch. 12 a 'Rhapsodie'. Far more radical is the criticism of those scholars who assume that this chapter has undergone one or more extensions. According to Duhm vv. 4–10 and 22–23 are later additions. Fohrer takes vv. 7–11 and 12–25 as 'spätere Einfügungen'.[3] Horst restricts these expansions to vv. 7–10 and 22; Hölscher and De Wilde only take vv. 7–10 as a gloss.[4] As far as vv. 7–12 are concerned I follow the interpretation of Gordis and Clines that these verses are an 'ironic statement' by Job of what he imagines the friends have been saying to him (Clines; as against Swanepoel). With regard to the hymnic phrases in the second part of the poem, Fohrer has aptly pointed out the very special character of these words. Next, Swanepoel has rightly attempted to interpret the passage concerned in the context of the book of Job in its entirety. However, there is no need to take these verses as a later addition; cf. 9,5–10.[5] They anticipate the 'final' dénouement in chs. 25–26.[6] The rhetorical analysis of ch. 12 further supports the integrity of MT on this point.

---

[1] So Schlottmann and Weiser. On the same grounds Möller (pp. 41–42) and Hartley divide this speech into 12,2–13,17 and 13,18–14,22; Driver-Gray and Clines draw the major dividing-line between 13,19 and 13,20 (cf. Terrien).

[2] So Hitzig, Delitzsch, Ley, Kroeze, Skehan (1971, pp. 105–07), Andersen, Webster; cf. also Dillmann, Horst, Habel and Michel.

[3] So also M.G. Swanepoel, 'Job 12—An(other) Anticipation of the Voice from the Whirlwind?', *OTE* 4 (1991), pp. 192–205; note p. 194.

In my opinion, each of the three poems of this speech, in broad outline, breaks up into two main parts (so rightly Horst). In ch. 12 a main disjunction between vv. 13 and 14 divides the poem into two proportional cantos of twelve lines each: 'Témoignage de l'expérience' (vv. 2–13) and 'Le divin destructeur' (vv. 14–25).[7] It is chiefly the stylistic device of inclusio that determines the structure of this composition. The noun *ḥkmh* ('wisdom') in vv. 12–13 marks the end of the first canto. With this word the poet rounds off the first main unit by inclusio; see *ḥkmh* in v. 2b.[8] In terms of content the noun *ḥkmh* can be understood as a key-word of the first canto (and of the composition as a whole; see below). But note also the prep. *'m* ('with') in anal. 11.4.5.

The second canto (vv. 14–25) is enclosed by a less striking, verbal repetition. The *penultimate* expression in the cola of v. 14 is *wl'* ('and not'; internally parallel). This *wl'* does not recur until the last line of the canto; see the *penultimate wl'* in v. 25a (and cf. *l'* in v. 24b).[9] See also the suffix *-m* and *'rṣ* ('land') in anal. 11.4.5. From a thematic point of view the cantos are connected with each other by extension of ideas. The second canto elaborates the conclusion of canto I that only God has real wisdom and power, v. 13 (prolepsis).

Probably the poet marked the cantos by yet other stylistic features. The repetition of *hn* ('behold') in vv. 14–15, just at the beginning of the verse-lines (anaphora), already indicates an important caesura in the poem. This phenomenon matches the rhetorical devices which can be observed at the end of the cantos. See *tbwnh* ('understanding') precisely at the end of the last two lines of canto I (vv. 12–13; epiphora) and *wyt'm* ('and he makes them wander') precisely at the beginning of the second cola of the last two lines in canto II (vv. 24–25; 'anaphora').[10] *wtrk* ('and she will teach you') in vv. 7–8 (precisely at the end of the first cola) could be understood as an indication of the beginning of canticle I.2. This repetitive, external parallelism probably forms an inclusio with *tbwnh* in vv. 12–13.

---

[4] About these emendations see also Gordis, p. 523.

[5] See also Gordis, p. 524.

[6] See below about v. 22 especially, and part VII, 1.2.2.

[7] Cf. anal. 11.2. So also Schlottmann, Hitzig, Peters, Möller, TOB, Van Selms; the descriptive phrases are TOB's. Wright, Dillmann, König and Swanepoel put the main caesura between vv. 12 and 13 (cf. Terrien), Schlögl and Hartley between vv. 11 and 12, Merx and Horts between vv. 10 and 11.

[8] Cf. Habel (p. 215) and Swanepoel (p. 193).

[9] See for the possible importance of such seemingly insignificant expressions the observations about 4,17–19; anal. 3.6 above.

Primarily on thematic grounds the cantos of ch. 12 each divide into two canticles; note the semantic parallelism between canticles I.1 and I.2 (see anal. 11.2). See for II.1 and II.2 also *'l* and *msyr* in anal. 11.4.4. When we take into consideration the length of these canticles a symmetric pattern emerges: 5.7|7.5. The analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as a whole proves that we find here a fundamental structure of the composition; see anal. 11.4.5. There is a very well-considered distribution of at least eight words and combinations of words. Some of these words are special for our poem; so the noun *'m* in vv. 2 and 24,[11] the noun *bwz* in vv. 5 and 21,[12] and the root *ṭ'm*.[13] The symmetrical pattern these verbal repetitions constitute within ch. 12 once more supports my view that the main break comes only after v. 13. This line contains three words that play an important part in the symmetric framework. Critics who connect these words with vv. 14–16 to form a 'Kreisstrophe'[14] fail to note that the verbal repetitions they have detected are part of a phenomenon that characterizes the poem as a whole.

The strophic structure of the poem is based on a combination of thematic and formal arguments (see anal. 11.2–4). According to Dhorme v. 22 has nothing in common with the doxology in which it is actually found.[15] Anal. 11.4.3, however, shows that v. 22 forms an integral part of the poem.[16]

---

[10] Scholars like Dillmann, Terrien, Epping-Nelis, Habel and Swanepoel, who draw a main dividing-line between vv. 12 and 13, cannot do justice to this phenomenon; see also below, about the canticle-structure.

[11] The repeated and striking use of the noun *'m* ('people') in ch. 12 just points to its originality. In the book of Job we elsewhere come across this noun only in 17,6 34,20.30 36,20.31.

[12] In the book of Job we elsewhere come across the root *bwz* only in 31,34.

[13] See elsewhere only Job 6,6 and 34,3.

[14] So Hontheim, p. 148. See also Habel (p. 217) and Swanepoel (p. 193); otherwise Clines.

[15] So also Duhm, Budde, Fohrer, Horst, Pope.

[16] Habel (p. 217) and Swanepoel (pp. 200–01) interpret the verbal repetitions of *ḥšk* and *'wr* again as inclusions. Hartley characterizes v. 22 as a 'hymnic refrain', and according to Clines the verse repeats 'the orientation of vv. 13–16'.

The line is variously interpreted to make it fit the context (see De Wilde). According to König, Kroeze, Van Selms and Hartley v. 22 deals with the hidden deliberations of powerful leaders.[17] Notwithstanding his textcritical operation Dhorme, I think, provides the correct interpretation of the verse: 'Les profondeurs sont celles du Shéol (cf. XI, 8)'; so also Pope—cf. Terrien, Andersen and Alter (1985, p. 91). Because v. 22 contains obvious reminiscences of 10,21–22 and 11,8 the verse refers to God's control of the depths and darkness of the underworld (Pope).[18] With this meaning the line is even indispensable in determining the special character of canticle II.2; see anal. 11.2. But more important is that the line plays an indispensable part in the flow of the contents of cycles I–II.[19]

The symmetric overall structure of ch. 12, finally, also provides an indication of where we have to look for the *quintessential thought* in this poem. The first line of the poem (v. 2) expresses the friends' lack of wisdom. The wandering in darkness of the rulers of nations, which is formulated in the final line (v. 25), forms an allusion to this opening statement (cf. Ps. 82,5 and Isa. 44,25) and stresses the same idea. As opposed to this lack of wisdom with the friends, Job portrays the wisdom of God. This theme is put in a nutshell in the pivotal colon of the composition, v. 13a.[20] This colon actually expresses the central idea of the poem as a whole: Job declares his conviction that *God has the wisdom* to clarify the paradox he experiences in his life. With this statement Job immediately reacts to Zophar's depiction of God's wisdom in 11,5–6 (note *ḥkmh* in 11,6a).

---

[17] The interpretation of Habel that 'God does not shed light, but darkness and frustration' must be excluded from the very start. Somehow the line must have a positive meaning; cf. Dan. 2,22.

[18] See for the root *'mq* in the book of Job: 11,8 (!) 39,10.21; for the noun *ṣlmwt*: 3,5 10,21.22 16,16 24,17.17 28,3 34,22 38,17. According to Michel, v. 22 seems to be the counterpart to 9,7.

[19] Cf. also 9,13b; see part VII, 1.2.2.

[20] Because of the fact that the poem is composed of two identical cantos there is no pivotal line. The tricola in vv. 3, 4 and 6, however, cause a pivotal colon, v. 13a. Note also the prolepsis in v. 13 described above.

12 Job’s first reply to Zophar (2): Job 13

Structure: 4 12.12 > 4 4.4.4|4.4.4 > 2.2 2.2|2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2|2.2

I [1] *hn KL r’th ‘yny*   *ŠM‘H ’ZNy wtbn lh*
[2] *kd‘tkm YD‘TY gm ’NY*   *l’ npl ’nky mkm*

[3] *’wlm ’NY ’l šdy ’dbr*   *whwkḥ ’l ’l ’ḥpṣ*
[4] *w’wlm ’tm ṭply šqr*   *rp’y ’ll KLkm*

II.1 [5] *MY ytn HḤRŠ TḤRYŠWN*   *wthy lkm lḥkmh*
[6] *ŠM‘W N’* **twkḥt***y*   *wRBWT śpty hqšybw*

[7] *hl’l tdbrw ‘wlh*   *wlw tdbrw rmyh*
[8] *hPNY***w tś’wn**   *’m l’l TRYBWN*

II.2 [9] *hṭwb ky yḥqr ’tkm*   *’m khtl b’nwš thtlw bw*
[10] **hwkḥ ywkyḥ** *’tkm*   *’m bSTR PNYM* **tś’wn**

[11] *hl’ ś’tw TB‘T ’tkm*   *wpḥdw ypl ‘lykm*
[12] *zkrnykm mšly ’pr*   *lgby ḥmr gbykm*

II.3 [13] **hḥryšw** *mmny w’dbrh ’ny*   *wy‘br ‘ly mh*
[14] *‘lmh ’ś’ bśry bšny*   *wnpšy ’ŚYM bkpy*

[15] *hn yqṭlny lw ’yḥl*   *’k drky ’l* **pnyw ’wkyḥ**
[16] *gm HW’ ly lyšw‘h*   *ky l’ l***pnyw** *ḥnp ybw’*

III.1 [17] *ŠM‘W ŠMW‘ mlty*   *w’ḥwty b’ZNYkm*
[18] *hnh N’ ‘rkty mšpṭ*   *YD‘TY ky ’NY ’ṣdq*

[19] *MY* **hw’** *YRYB ‘mdy*   *ky ‘th ’ḤRYŠ w’gw‘*
[20] *’k štym ’l t‘ś ‘mdy*   *’z mPNY***k** *l’* **’str**

III.2 [21] *kpk m‘ly hrḥq*   *w’mtk ’l TB‘Tny*
[22] *wqr’ w’nky ’‘nh*   *’w ’dbr whšybny*

[23] *kmh ly ‘wnwt wḥṭ’wt*   *pš‘y wḥṭ’ty hd‘ny*
[24] *lmh PNY***k** *TSTYR*   *wtḥšbny l’wyb lk*

III.3 [25] *h'lh ndp t'rwṣ*   *w't qš ybš trdp*
[26] *ky tktb 'ly mrrwt*   *wtwryšny 'wnwt n'wry*

[27] *wTŚM bsd rgly*   *wtšmwr KL 'rḥwty*   *'l šršy rgly ttḥqh*
[28] *wHW' krqb yblh*   *kbgd 'klw 'š*

12.1 Text

V. 12b—*gb*: it is generally agreed that the parallelism suggests the meaning 'answer, response', not 'shield (boss of a shield)' (NBG) or 'defense' (RSV, Habel).

V. 14a—*'lmh*: 'forever'; so Michel, following Dahood. MT opens the colon with *'l mh* ('why'), which words are frequently deleted as a dittography of the closing words of v. 13 (Reiske, Budde, Dhorme, Horst, Van Selms, Habel [?], Clines).

V. 15a—*lw*: 'for Him'; so Q (Dhorme, Horst, Fohrer, De Wilde; cf. Andersen, pp. 166–67). K *l'* ('not'). Modern interpreters believe that the context strongly favours the K (Hölscher, Gordis [note p. 144], Van Selms, Habel, Hartley, Clines [note pp. 312–13]). In my opinion, it is the reading *lw* (Q) which is corroborated by the context. Vv. 15–16 (II.3, vv. 13–16) especially deal *with God* as Job's only recourse (see anal. 12.2 below). The first words of v. 15 (*hn yqṭlny*) focus the attention on God and underline the paradox Job is confronted with: God is going to kill Job, nevertheless (so Job trusts) He will save him. See also *lw* in anal. 12.4.4 and the following note on v. 16a.

V. 16a—*hw'*: 'He'; cf. Ex. 15,2 Isa. 12,2 Ps. 118,21 (so Schlottmann, Ehrlich, Peters, Szczygiel, NBG, Gordis, Michel). This word is generally taken as a neutrum: 'this'. See also anal. 12.6 below (n. 14).

V. 28: Since Merx many have considered this verse to be out of context and relocate it at the beginning of ch. 14 (note Horst, p. 206). Schlottmann and Dillmann, however, already pointed out the thematic similarity between vv. 28 and 25. The subject switches from the first to the third person with no obvious antecedent. And *whw'* in v. 28a perfectly fits the formal structure of the poem; note *gm hw'* in v. 16a (see analysis 12.4.5 and cf. Kroeze, Habel, Hartley and Clines). According to Michel the verse is 'an effective punchline'.

12.2 Content

Job will confidently present his lawsuit before God.

I Introduction: Job's intention to put his lawsuit before God because the friends are no help to him.
  I am not second to you in wisdom (vv. 1–2).

I am going to address myself to God, because your talk is useless to me (vv. 3–4).

II Job will address himself to God and rejects the wisdom of the friends (cf. v. 4).

II.1 Job will put his case before God.

Please be silent and listen to my defence (vv. 5–6).

There is no need for you to defend God (vv. 7–8).

II.2 You have to fear the *terrifying* judgement of God if your statements should appear to be worthless (vv. 9–12).

II.3 Job persists in seeking safety with God.

I know the risks when I am going to plead my case with God (vv. 13–14).

God is my only recourse because I am righteous (vv. 15–16).

III Job will confidently present his lawsuit before God (cf. v. 3).

III.1 Job will confidently take his stand against God (cf. II.1).

Listen to my defence, I am righteous (vv. 17–18; cf. vv. 5–6 and v. 16).

In a fair trial I will not hide myself from God (vv. 19–20).

III.2 Job will challenge God not to *terrify* him any longer (cf. II.2).

Let God take away His terrifying anger from me, then, we can speak about my case (vv. 21–22).

Why does God consider me as his enemy? (vv. 23–24).

III.3 Job reproaches God for persecuting a person (cf. v. 15a) who is totally exhausted.

12.3 Transition markers

12.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

12.3.1.1 *hn*, v. 1a
’wlm, v. 3a; // *’wlm* in v. 4a
’ny, v. 3a
my ytn, v. 5a
ḥrš, v. 5a
paronom. infinitive constr.: *hḥrš tḥryšwn*, v. 5a
jussive: *wthy*, v. 5b; ext. // *šmʿw* in v. 6a and *hqšybw* in v. 6b
h- interr., v. 7a; ext. // *h*- interr. in v. 8a
h- interr., v. 9a
’nwš, v. 9b
h- interr., v. 11a
ḥrš, v. 13a
imperative: *hḥryšw*, v. 13a

cohortative: *’dbrh*, v. 13a
’ny, v. 13a
mh, v. 13b; ext. // *mh** in v. 14a
hn, v. 15a
’k, v. 15b
imperative: *šm‘w*, v. 17a
paronom. inf. constr.: *šm‘w šmw‘*, v. 17a
my, v. 19a
hw’, v. 19a
‘th, v. 19b
ḥrš, v. 19b
kmh, v. 23a; ext. // *lmh* in v. 24a
h- interr., v. 25a
w- beginn. line, v. 27a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in v. 28a

12.3.1.2 *’l* (prohib.), v. 21b

12.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

12.3.2.1 *gm*, v. 2a
’nky, v. 2b
gm, v. 16a
antithetic parallelism, v. 16
’l (prohib.), v. 20a
’nky, v. 22a
anaphora: *w-* ext. // *w-* beginn. line, vv. 27–28

12.3.2.2 *w-* beginning line, v. 4a
’tm, v. 4a
hw’, v. 16a
ḥnp, v. 16b
’k, v. 20a
’z, v. 20b
hw’, v. 28a

12.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

’ny, v. 2a
n’, v. 6a
paronom. inf. constr.: *hwkḥ ywkyḥ*, v. 10a
hnh, v. 18a
n’, v. 18a
’ny, v. 18b
w- beginning line, v. 22a

12.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

12.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’wlm*, vv. 3, 4; *’zn*, vv. 1, 17; *’k*, vv. 15, 20; *’l* (‘God’), vv. 3, 7, 8; *’l* (prep.), vv. 3, 3, 15; *’l* (proh.), vv. 20, 21; *’m*, vv. 8, 9, 10; *’ny*, vv. 2, 3, 13, 18; *’nky*, vv. 2, 22; *’t* (nota acc.), vv. 9, 10, 11
b: *b-*, vv. 9, 9, 10, 14, 14, 17, 27; *b‘t*, vv. 11, 21
g: *gb*, vv. 12, 12; *gm*, vv. 2, 16
d: *dbr*, vv. 3, 7, 7, 13, 22
h: *h-* interr., vv. 7, 8, 9, 11, 25; *hw’*, vv. 16, 19, 28; *hn*, vv. 1, 15, 18 (*hnh*); *htl*, vv. 9, 9
w: *-w*, vv. 7, 8, 9, 11, 11, 15*, 15, 16, 28
ḥ: *ḥṭ’*, vv. 23, 23; *ḥrš*, vv. 5, 5, 13, 19

y: *-y*, vv. 1, 1, 6, 6, 13, 14 (4×), 15, 16, 17, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23 (3×), 26, 26, 27 (3×); *yd‘*, vv. 2, 2, 18, 23; *ykḥ*, vv. 3, 6, 10, 10, 15
k: *k-*, vv. 2, 9, 23, 28, 28; *-k*, vv. 20, 21, 21, 24, 24; *ky*, vv. 9, 16, 18, 19, 26; *kl*, vv. 1, 4, 27; *-km*, vv. 2, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 11, 12, 12, 17; *kp*, vv. 14, 21
l: *l-*, vv. 1, 5, 5, 7, 7, 8, 12, 15*, 16 (3×), 23, 24 (3×); *l’*, vv. 2, 11, 16, 20
m: *mh*, vv. 13, 23, 24; *my*, vv. 5, 19; *mn*, vv. 2, 13, 20, 21
n: *n’*, vv. 6, 18; *-ny*, vv. 13, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26; *npl*, vv. 2, 11; *nś’*, vv. 8, 10, 11, 14
s: *str*, vv. 10, 20, 24
‘: *‘wn*, vv. 23, 26; *‘l*, vv. 11, 13, 21, 26, 27; *‘md*, vv. 19, 20
p: *pnym*, vv. 8, 10, 15, 16, 20, 24
r: *rgl*, vv. 27, 27; *ryb*, vv. 6, 8, 19
ś: *śym*, vv. 14, 27
š: *šm‘*, vv. 1, 6, 17, 17

12.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 3–4: *’wlm*, vv. 3a.4a!—linear
’l . . . ’l ’l/’ll, vv. 3 and 4b resp.—alliteration
vv. 7–8: *h-* interr., vv. 7a.8a—exactly linear
l’l, vv. 7a.8b!; see also *l-* in v. 7b
-w, vv. 7b.8a
vv. 9–10: *’tkm*, vv. 9a.10a—linear
’m, vv. 9b.10b—exactly linear
b-, vv. 9b (2×).10b
vv. 11–12: *-km* int. // *-km*, vv. 11.12
vv. 15–16: *l-*, vv. 15a*.16 (3×)
pnyw, vv. 15b.16b; see also *-w* in v. 15a*
vv. 19–20: *‘mdy*, vv. 19a.20a!—linear
vv. 23–24: *kmh/lmh*, vv. 23a and 24a resp.!—exactly linear
l-, vv. 23a.24 (3×)

12.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 5–8 (II.1): *l-*, vv. 5b (2×).7a+b+8b
ryb, vv. 6b.8b—linear
vv. 9–12 (II.2): *h-* interr., vv. 9a.11a—exactly linear
’tkm, vv. 9a+10a.11a—concatenatio; see also *-km* in vv. 11b and 12a+b
-w, vv. 9b.11a+b
nś’, vv. 10b.11a—concatenatio

vv. 13–16 (II.3): *-ny*, vv. 13a.15a—linear
vv. 21–24 (III.2): *-k* // *-k*, vv. 21.24—inclusio
-ny, vv. 21b+22b.23b+24b
whšybny/*wtḥšbny*, vv. 22b and 24b resp. (alliter.) —linear

12.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–4 (canto I): *kl*, vv. 1a.4b—inclusio
-km, vv. 2b.4b—exactly linear; see also v. 2a
’ny, vv. 2a.3a—concat.; see also *’nky* in v. 2b

vv. 5–16 (canto II): *ḥrš* hiph‘il, vv. 5a (2×).13a—linear
ykḥ, vv. 6a.10a (2×).15b
lw, vv. 7b.15a*—linear
l-, vv. 5b (2×)+7a+b+8b.12b.15a*+16 (3×); note *lw* in vv. 7b and 15a*—linear
h- interr., vv. 8a.9a—concatenatio
pnyw, vv. 8a.15b+16b—linear; see also *pnym* in v. 10b
pnym + *tś’wn*, vv. 8a.10b! (Andersen: inclusio [p. 165 n. 1])
nś’, vv. 8a.10b+11a.14a!
’m, vv. 8b.9b+10b!—concatenatio
b-, vv. 9b (2×)+10b.14a+b—linear
l’, vv. 11a.16b—linear

vv. 17–28 (canto III): *b-*, vv. 17b.27a—‘inclusio’
hw’, vv. 19a.28a—linear
’l (proh.), vv. 20a.21b!—concatenatio
mn, vv. 20b.21a—concatenatio
-k, vv. 20b.21a+b—concatenatio
pnyk + *str*, vv. 20b.24a—linear
’mh ... *b‘t*/*‘rṣ*, vv. 21b and 25a resp.—linear
k-, vv. 23a.28a+b—linear
‘wnwt, vv. 23a.26b!

12.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 1–4.27–28, inclusio: *kl*, vv. 1a+4b.27b!

k-, vv. 2a.28a+b
w- beginning line, vv. 4a.27a+28a

vv. 1–4.5–8.17–20: *hn*/*hnh*, vv. 1a and 18a resp.—linear; but cf. also *hn* in v. 15a
šm‘, vv. 1b.6a.17a (2×)!—linear
’zn, vv. 1b.17b!—linear
yd‘, vv. 2a (2×).18b—linear; note *yd*‘*ty* in vv. 2a and 18b!
’ny, vv. 2a+3a.18b; but cf. also v. 13a
dbr, vv. 3a.7a+b—linear
ykḥ, vv. 3b.6a
’l (‘God’), vv. 3b.7a+8b!—linear
’ll/*l’l*, vv. 4b and 7a+8b resp. (alliter.)—linear
klkm/*lkm lḥkmh*, vv. 4b and 5b resp. (alliter.) —concatenatio
my, vv. 5a.19a!
ḥrš hiph., vv. 5a (2×).19b
n’, vv. 6a.18a!—exactly linear
ryb, vv. 6b+8b.19a!
pnym, vv. 8b.20b—linear

vv. 9–12.21–24: *k*-, vv. 9b.23a
str, vv. 10b.24a
pnym, vv. 10b.24a
tb‘*t*, vv. 11a.21b!; see also *pḥd* in v. 11b and *’mh* in v. 21b

vv. 13–16.25–28: *śym*, vv. 14b.27a!
-*w*, vv. 15a*+b+16b.28b—linear
drky/ *’rḥwty*, vv. 15b and 27b resp.!—linear
hw’, vv. 16a.28a—exactly linear; but cf. v. 19a too!

12.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

12.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

’ny, *dbr*, *h*- interr. (v. 25), -*y*, *yd*‘ (v. 23), *l*- (v. 1), *l’*, *mh* v. 13), *mn*, -*ny* (v. 26)

12.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

’k, *’nky*, (*gb*), *gm*, *hn*, (*htl*), (*ḥṭ’*), *ky*, *kp*, *npl*, ‘*l*, (*rgl*)

12.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): …|1–5.6–10.11–13.14–16|17–19.20–22.23–25.26–28|… (…|5.5.3.3|4×3|…)

Stickel (1842): …1–6.7–12.13–16|17–22.23–28|… (…6.6.4|6.6|…)

Schlottmann (1851): …|1–3.4–5|6–8.9–10.11–12; 13–14.15–16.17–19. 20–22|23–25.26–28.14,1–3|… (…|3.2|3.2.2; 2.2.3.3|3.3.3|…)

Ewald (1854): …|1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13.14–16.17–19.20–22|23–28… (4×3.1.3×3|6…)

Merx (1871): …1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–18.19–21.22–24|25–27… (…8×6|7…)

Hitzig (1874): …||1–6.7–12.13–19.20–22.23–28||… (…||6.6.7.3.6||…)

Delitzsch (1876): …|1–2.3–6.7–11.12–16.17–19.20–22.23–25.26–28|… (…|4.8.10.10.6.6.6.7|…)

Wright (1883): …|1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–16|17–19.20–22.23–25.26–27|… (…|4×6.8|3×6.5|…)

Dillmann (1891): …||1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12|13–16.17–19.20–22|23–25.26–28|| … (…||4×6|8.6.6|6.7||…)

Bickell (1894): …1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.18–19a+20a. 21–22.23–24.25–26.27*…

Ley (1895): 1–6.7–12.13–18.19–23.24–28 (6.6.6.5.5)

Duhm (1897): …|1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16.18–19|20–21. 22–23.24–25.26–27b.27c+14,5c+13,28|…; cf. Hölscher (1952)

Vetter (1897): …|1–2|3–6|7–12|13–22|23–27*|…

Hontheim (1904): …||1–6|7–12||13–16||17–19|20–22||23–27||… (…|6.6|4| 3.3|5|…)

Schlögl (1916): …12,23–13,8.9–19.20–27+14,1–2+13,28… (…22.22.22…)

Ball (1922): …1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20. 21–22.23–24.25–26.27a+c–28…

Peters (1928): …|1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–14.15–16.17–19|20–22.23–24. 25–27|… (…|4×3.2.2.3|3.2.3|…)

König (1929): …1–12.13–28…

Kissane (1939): …|1–5.6–11.12–16|17–22.23–27… (…|5.6.5.6.5…)

Irwin (1946): 1–3.4–6|7–9.10–12|13–14.15–16|17–19.20–22|23–25.26–27|… (3.3|3.3|2.2|3.3|3.3|…)

Möller (1955): …1–12.13–17; 18–27… (…12.5; 10…)

Skehan (1961): …|1–5|6–11.12–16.17–22.23–27|… (…|2.3|6.5.6.5|…); cf. Kissane (1939), NAB (1970), MacKenzie (1990)

Fohrer (1963): …1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12|13–15.16+18–19.20–22.23–25.26–28| … (…4×3|5×3|…); cf. Merx (1871)

Terrien (1963): …||1–3.4–6|7–9.10–12|13–16.17–19||20–22|23–25|26–28|| …; cf. Wright (1883) and Fohrer (1963)
Epping-Nelis (1968): …1–5|6–12|13–17.18–22|23–27|…
Horst (1968): 3–12|13–17|18–22.23–27 (10|5|5.5)
TOB (1978): …|1–5.6–12.13–16.17–19|20–22.23–28|…
KBS (1980): 1–5.6–11.12–22.23–27.28
De Wilde (1981): …1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17. 18a+19a+18b+19b.20–21.22–23.24–25.26–27|…
Van Selms (1982): …1–12.13–19.20–27…
Webster (1983): 1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–16.17–19.20–22.23–27; cf. Wright (1883) and Terrien (1963)
Habel (1985): 6.7–11.12|13.14–16|17.18.19–23|24–25.26–27.28 (a.b.c|a’.d| a’’.d’.e|f.f’.g)
Bezuidenhout (1986): …||1–5.6–9.10–12|13–16.17–19||20–22.23–25. 26–28||… (…||5.4.3|4.3||3.3.3||…)
Michel (1987): 1–3.4–5.6–8.9–11.12–14.15–16.17–18.19–22.23–25.26–28. 14,1–3
Hartley (1988): …|1–12.13–17; 18–22.23–28|…
Clines (1989): …1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–16.17–19|20–22.23–25.26–28 (…4×3.4.3|3.3.3…)
MacKenzie (1990): …|1–5.6–11|12–16.17–22.23–27|…

12.6 Comments and summary

Anal. 12.5 shows a literally indescribable variety of opinions as far as the grouping of the lines into higher structural units in ch. 13 is concerned. This gives away that it is actually impossible to determine the rhetorical structure of the poem on the basis of its content only. Many scholars assume that there has to be an important caesura in ch. 13, because in its beginning Job addresses his friends and at its end he speaks to God (cf. anal. 11.6 above, first paragraph). There is, however, no consensus as to the correct position of the dividing-line. According to some critics the first main part ends with v. 12,[1] according to others with v. 16,[2] or v. 17.[3] But Job does not seem to address himself explicitly to God until v. 20. So others put the main break in this chapter precisely after v. 19.[4] Horst tries to do justice to this ambiguous situation by taking vv. 13–17 as a transitional strophe, in which Job calls on the friends to serve as witnesses in his lawsuit with God. The pattern of the external, repetitive parallelisms in ch. 13, however, provides conclusive proof that the direction of address is not a reliable criterion to determine the rhetorical structure of a Hebrew poem. Moreover, we can observe in anal. 12.5 that, when ch. 13 is taken as a relatively individual poetic unit within this speech of Job, there is no consensus among critics about the exact beginning and end of this poem. Since Merx many critics have somehow connected v. 28 with the following poem.[5] Modern interpreters are further inclined to take the correspondences between the beginning of ch. 13 and the beginning of ch. 12 as an inclusio. Therefore they split off the opening verses of ch. 13 from the main body of the poem; so Horst (vv. 1–2) and Habel (vv. 1–5). Skehan takes vv. 1–5 as a 'transitional, 5-line grouping' (p. 106).

---

[1] So Schlottmann, Dillmann, König, Fohrer; cf. also Duhm.
[2] Köster, Stickel, Wright, Kissane.
[3] Möller, Hartley.
[4] Peters, Terrien, TOB, Clines; cf. also Duhm.

Ch. 13 is again a fine example of the formal methods that were used to compose a Hebrew poem. In this chapter it is especially the stylistic device of responsio—linear, external, repetitive parallelism—that determines the caesuras in the development of the content. On this basis I discern an opening, four-line canto (vv. 1–4), which is followed by two identical cantos of twelve lines each (vv. 5–16 and 17–28).[6] At this level of the macrostructure the poet primarily placed the verbal repetitions at the *beginning* of the units. The most striking responsio on this level is formed by the repetition of the root *šmʻ* ('to listen') in vv. 1b, 6a and 17a; anal. 12.4.5.[7] This root turns up at the beginning of all three main parts and is not found anywhere else in the poem. The beginning of the first and the third canto is marked by many other verbal repetitions; see *hn/hnh*, *'zn*, *ydʻ*, *'ny* in anal. 12.4.5 (cf. also *n'* and *pnym* at the beginning of the second and the third canto).

On the basis of these formal observations it might be concluded that v. 6 is to represent the first line of canto II (note also the imperative *šmʻw n'* in v. 6a). Most critics also connect v. 5 with the preceding verse (see anal. 12.5). Nevertheless, I think v. 5 has to be taken as the beginning of the first canto. Note the following considerations: (a) *my ytn* (v. 5a) is an obvious indication of the beginning of a new strophe (see part VI, 3.1); (b) *ḥrš* hiphʻil ('to be silent'; v. 5a) in a first line perfectly fits the framework of the canticles of canto II (see below); (c) the paronomastic infinitive construction *hḥrš tḥryšwn* (v. 5a) matches the same construction in the first line of canto II (see *šm‘w šmw‘* in v. 17a); (d) vv. 3–4 form an antithetic, external parallelism, which closes the end of the first canto: Job trustfully addresses himself to God (v. 3), but with disappointment turns away from his friends (v. 4; cf. the antithetic parallelism at the end of the second canto, v. 16!);[8] (e) v. 5 being the opening verse of the second canto, then, the noun *ḥkmh* is the last word of the first line of this canto; cf. *ḥkmh* in 12,2b.[9]

---

[5] Wright, Bickell, Hontheim, Peters, Kissane, Irwin, Skehan, Epping-Nelis, Horst, De Wilde, Webster, MacKenzie; cf. anal. 12.1 above.

[6] Cf. the 12-line cantos of the preceding poem.

[7] Skehan notes that *šmʻ* characterizes the beginning of vv. 6–11 and 17–22 (p. 107). According to Habel the units vv. 6–12, 13–16 and 17–23 are introduced with a formal summons to listen (vv. 6, 13, 17; p. 226). Horst takes the 'Lehreröffnungsformel' of vv. 13 and 17 as an inclusio which demarcates the transitional strophe of vv. 13–17. Each of these critics, however, fails to mention the occurrence of the root *šmʻ* in v. 1b.

Analysis 12.4.5 further shows that the pattern of the verbal repetitions is not restricted to the beginning of the cantos alone; see especially the responsions between vv. 9–12 and 21–24,[10] and the responsions between vv. 13–16 and 25–28 (note *śym* and *hw’*).[11] This stage of the analysis also proves that the first lines of ch. 13 cannot be connected with the preceding poem; see the numerous verbal repetitions between vv. 1–4 on the one hand, and vv. 5–8 and 17–20 on the other hand (against Horst and Habel). The correspondences between the beginning of ch. 13 and the beginning of ch. 12 (see especially *l’ npl ·’nky mkm* in 13,2b and 12,3b, and *ḥkmh* in 13,5 and 12,2) constitute linear allusions at the beginning of successive poems.[12]

The 12-line cantos fall into sub-sections that also display a rigid regularity, the canticles. Conforming to the extent of the introductory canto I, the 12-line cantos divide into an uninterrupted sequence of three 4-line canticles. This structural level is formally marked by the device of linear, external repetition as well. But on this level the most obvious responsions are found at the *end* of the canticles. The canticle structure of the poem is, in the first place, indicated by the noun *pnym* (‘face’). The repetition of this noun in the last lines of canticles II.1, II.3, III.1 and III.2 (see anal. 12.4.4) constitutes a fine example of ‘Wortresponsion’ at the end of a series of identical units.[13] In canticle II.2, however, the poet uses *pnym* not in the last but in the second line of the unit, v. 10b. Although we are not dealing here with a linear, verbal repetition the noun actually characterizes II.2 as an individual sub-unit of canto II. Moreover, the colon in question, *'m bstr pnym tś'wn* (v. 10b), puts us on the track of yet other responsions demarcating the end of the canticles; see the root *str* ('to hide') in anal. 12.4.4–5, and *tś'wn/nś'* in anal. 12.4.4. The phenomenon of 'displacement' of the responsions in canticle II.2 (v. 10b), finally, seems to be compensated by an external, verbal repetition which obviously marks the beginning of canticle II.3; see *ḥrš* hiph'il in anal. 12.4.4.

---

[8] See also below about the function of vv. 3–4 within the structure of the poem in its entirety.

[9] Habel takes this verbal repetition as an inclusio which demarcates the first poem of this speech.

[10] Together with 1 Sam. 16 (see vv. 14–15) this is the only chapter in the Hebrew Bible where we find the root *b‘t* twice. This fact confirms my view about the stylistic function of this verb within our chapter.

[11] So, like v. 5, the final line of ch. 13 (v. 28) also belongs to the main body of the poem (in spite of Horst's opinion that the tricolon of v. 27 concludes the poem of ch. 13 [pp. 186 and 205]). This main body (cantos II–III), with its 24 lines, does not display ‘alphabetic’ length (against Skehan).

[12] Cf., e.g., *w’ynny/’ynnw* at the end of chs. 7 and 8, and *‘d ’nh* at the beginning of chs. 18 and 19.

[13] Habel, too, considers the noun *pnym* as a key-word in ch. 13 (pp. 215, 226–27). This exegete, however, fails to see the regular pattern in the repetition of *pnym*, nor does he mention the other responsions which occur on this structural level.

Only at this point is it possible to assess with some certainty the train of thought in the poem. Horst rightly points out that in vv. 3–4 (first canto) Job gives an indication of the themes which will be dealt with in the following units of this chapter (so already Dillmann). The first line of the strophe (I am going to address myself to God, v. 3) corresponds with the third canto: Job will defend his lawsuit before God; and the second line (your talk is useless, v. 4) corresponds with the second canto: Job rejects the wisdom of the friends (anal. 12.2). So there is a symmetrical ('chiastic') a.b.b'a'-pattern between vv. 3–4 and the cantos II–III of ch. 13. The beginning of the third canto ties in with the final thought of canto II. In v. 18b Job (again) proclaims his righteousness. This statement is presaged by the antithetic parallelism of v. 16, where Job tersely expresses his confidence in God (v. 16a) by contrasting it with the expectation for a godless man (v. 16b).[14] The *main development* of ideas in the second and the third cantos, however, shows a *linear* semantic parallelism; see anal. 12.2 and cf. anal. 12.4.5. The first canticles (II.1 and III.1) focus on Job's decision to bring his case before God. The second canticles (II.2 and III.2) deal with God's (possible) intimidation (note especially *b't* in vv. 11 and 21). The third canticles (II.3 and III.3), finally, each refer to Job's approaching end (see for II.3 *hn yqṭlny* in v. 15a).[15]

In terms of content there is no exact disjunction between canticles III.1

---

[14] All modern (and nearly all earlier) exegetes take *hw'* in v. 16a as neuter (cf. anal. 12.1 above). This interpretation, in my view, weakens the antithetical parallelism which closes the second canto (cf. vv. 3–4). I take *ky* (v. 16b) as an emphatic particle (cf. *'k* in v. 15b) and translate *l' . . . ybw'* by 'he *may not* come' (cf. Budde, König, Weiser, Fohrer, Horst, Hartley; against the common translation '*dare not* approach'—cf. Delitzsch, Dhorme, Andersen, Clines a.o.). This negation contrasts with Job's conviction that God will be his salvation (against Dohrme and Clines). According to Clines 'any positive "salvation" he (Job) sees arises from his own innocence and his own courage (v. 16), not from the justice of God' (p. 312; see also p. 316). Such a reasoning, in my view, does no justice to the paradoxical image of God Job wrestles with.

[15] The first words of v. 15a are generally interpreted in the light of the risks Job reckons with in vv. 13b–14.

and III.2. Vv. 21–24 are an elaboration of Job's double wish in v. 20a. Note also the concatenations between III.1 and III.2 (anal. 12.4.4). The break in question is primarily based on special responsions; see *pnyk*, the root *str* and *bʿt*/*ʿrṣ* in anal. 12.4.4. These repetitions exactly fit the framework of the four-line canticles. Therefore, canticle III.2 is to be understood as a thematic extension of the final line (second last colon) of canticle III.1.

Because the formal framework of the poem is firmly determined by the four-line canticles, it is not difficult to determine its strophic structure. Once more we have to do with a rigid regularity. Every canticle is built up out of two 2-line strophes (see Bickell [!], Duhm, Ball [!], Hölscher, De Wilde in anal. 12.5). Note *'wlm* in v. 3a, *h-* interr. in v. 9a, *hn* and *'k* in v. 15, *my* and *ʿth* in v. 19, *kmh* in v. 23, *w-* beginning line in v. 27 (anal. 12.3.1.1); *'nky* in v. 2b (anal. 12.3.2.1); *'wlm*, *l'l*, *pnyw*, *ʿmdy*, *kmh*/*lmh* (anal. 12.4.2); *ryb*, *h-* interr., *-ny* in anal. 12.4.3. This result sharply deviates from the current view about the strophic structure of ch. 13, according to which we are mainly dealing with strophes of three (!) lines.[16]

The *main theme* of the poem is to be found, in my opinion, at the beginning of the second and the third cantos (cf. anal. 12.4.5), especially at the beginning of canto III: *Job will confidently bring his case before God because he is righteous.*[17] This idea can also be found in Job's famous and controversial statement of v. 15a: 'behold, He is going to kill me; He remains my hope'.[18] It may be noted that the colon in question also constitutes the pivotal colon of the poem as a whole.[19]

---

[16] So Ewald, Merx, Wright, Dillmann, Peters, Irwin, Fohrer, Terrien, Webster, Clines.

[17] This outcome partially goes along with the view of Clines that the *nodal verse* of Job's speech in chs. 12–14 is 13,3 (cf. anal. 12.2). However, the theme of innocence—a major element in Job's reasoning—is not expressed in this line.

[18] Cf. S. Schreiner, 'Der gottesfürchtige Rebell, oder wie die Rabbinen die Frömmigkeit Ijobs deuteten', *ZTK* 89 (1992), pp. 159–71.

[19] Because of the fact that the poem contains an even number of lines there is no pivotal line. The tricolon in v. 27, however, causes a pivotal colon, v. 15a. This colon is also included by an even number of words within the poem. The sum total of the words of vv. 1–14 is 99; we find the same sum total of 99 words in vv. 15b–28. Note also vv. 13–16 as the pivotal four-line unit in ch. 13 (cf. Horst's transitional strophe, vv. 13–17).

13 Job’s first reply to Zophar (3): Job 14

Structure: 12.10 > 6.6|5.5 > 3.3|3.3||3.2|2.3

I.1	[1] *’dm ylwd ’šh*	**qṣr** *YMYM wśb‘ rgz*	
	[2] *kṣyṣ yṣ’ wyml*	*wybrḥ kṣl wl’ y‘mwd*	
	[3] *’p ‘l zh pqḥt ‘ynK*	*w’tw TBY’ bmšpṭ ‘mK*	
	[4] *MY YTN ṭhwr mṭm’*	*l’ ’ḥd*	
	[5] *’m ḥrwṣym YMYw*	*MSPR ḥdšyw ’tK*	*ḤQw ‘śyt wl’ y‘bwr*
	[6] *š‘h m‘lyw wḥdl*	**‘d** *yrṣh kśkyr YWMw*	
I.2	[7] *ky yš l‘ṣ TQWH*	*’m ykrt w‘wd yḥlyp*	*wynqtw l’ tḥdl*
	[8] *’m yzqyn b’RṢ šršw*	*wb‘PR ymwt gz‘w*	
	[9] *mryḥ MYM yprḥ*	*w‘śh* **qṣyr** *kmw nṭ‘*	
	[10] *wgbr ymwt wyḥlš*	*wygw‘ ’dm w’yw*	
	[11] *’zlw MYM mny ym*	*wnhr yḥrb wybš*	
	[12] *w’yš škb wl’ YQWM*	**‘d** *blty šmym l’ yqyṣw*	*wl’ y‘rw mšntm*
II.1	[13] *MY YTN bš’wl tṣpnny*	*tstyrny ‘d šwb ’pK*	*tšyt ly ḤQ wtzkrny*
	[14] *’m ymwt gbr hyḥyh*	*kl YMY ṣb’y ’yḥl*	*‘d BW’ ḥlypty*
	[15] *tqr’ w’nky ’‘nK*	*lm‘śh ydyK tksp*	
	[16] *ky ‘th ṣ‘dy TSPWR*	*l’ tšmwr ‘l ḥṭ’ty*	
	[17] *ḥtm bṣrwr pš‘y*	*wtṭpl ‘l ‘wny*	
II.2	[18] *w’wlm hr nwpl ybwl*	*wṣwr y‘tq mMQMw*	
	[19] *’bnym šḥqw MYM*	*tšṭp spyḥyh ‘PR ’RṢ*	*wTQWT ’nwš h’bdt*
	[20] *ttqphw lnṣḥ wyhlk*	*mšnh pnyw wtšlḥhw*	
	[21] *ykbdw bnyw wl’ yd‘*	*wyṣ‘rw wl’ ybyn lmw*	
	[22] *’k bśrw ‘lyw yk’b*	*wnpšw ‘lyw t’bl*	

13.1 Text

V. 3b—*w’tw*: ‘and him’, with the versions (see BHS) and most modern critics. MT *w’ty* (‘and me’); so NBG, NJPS, Habel, Michel (cf. Gordis).

V. 4: some critics propose to delete this verse because the idea of uncleanness would not fit the context (Budde, Hölscher, Horst, Pope, De Wilde). But Dhorme rightly notes ‘que l’idée du 1er hémistiche est suggérée par *ylwd ’šh* du v. 1’; cf. anal. 13.6.

V. 6a—*wḥdl*: 'and let him be' (cf. 7,16 and 10,20; with most modern critics). MT *wyḥdl*; so NBG, Horst ('dass er Ruhe finde'). However, the meaning 'be at ease' for *ḥdl* cannot be paralleled.

V. 12b—*'d blty*: 'until no more'; cf. Ps. 72,7 Isa. 14,6 Mal. 3,10—'a strong image' (Habel). Dhorme reads *'d blwt* ('until the wearing out'; cf. Ps. 102,27 and Isa. 51,6).

V. 18a—*nwpl ybwl*: 'slips away and erodes' (Clines; cf. Isa. 24,4 for *nbl* with the meaning 'crumble away').

V. 19b—*spyḥyh*: 'her aftergrowth'; so MT. MT does not make sense here, because neither the meaning of the noun, nor its plural form, nor its pron. suff. is in accordance with the context. Since Budde most modern critics have read *sḥyph* ('Gussregen', 'torrent'; so also HAL). This emendation, however, is criticized by Clines because actually no Arabic cognate is known (cf. already Driver-Gray). Blommerde (p. 72) parses the final two consonants as the intensifying *-yāh* and translates: 'a *mighty* torrent'; so also Michel.

V. 20b—*mšnh pnyw*: 'You disfigure him' (Clines). The interpretation 'he contemplates treachery' (see B. Halpern, *VT* 28 [1978], pp. 472–74) is rejected by Habel and Clines.

13.2 Content

Complaint about the impossibility of a fair trial in view of the futility of human existence.

- I Appeal to God not to spy on mortal beings generally.
  - I.1 Appeal to God not to institute proceedings against a mortal, unclean man.
    - You are judging a mortal being (vv.1–3).
    - Since You have determined his lifespan do not judge an unclean man (vv. 4–6).
  - I.2 Complaint about *man's irreversible death.*
    - There is *hope* for a tree when cut down, because it can sprout again (vv. 7–9; tree metaphor).
    - But a dead man never comes to life again (vv. 10–12).
- II The impossibility for Job to stand a trial by God.
  - II.1 The impossibility for Job to stand a trial by God (about Job especially).
    - If a man could come to life again I would stand Your test (vv. 13–15);
    - Then You might forgive my sins (vv. 16–17).
  - II.2 Complaint about *man's irreversible death* (about mankind in general).

You destroy man’s *hope* (vv. 18–19; mountain metaphor). You kill him once for all, and he is unaware of things that come after him (vv. 20–22).

13.3 Transition markers

13.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

13.3.1.1 *my ytn*, v. 4a
w- beginning line, v. 10a
’y, v. 10b
my ytn, v. 13a
‘th, v. 16a
w- beginning line, v. 18a
’wlm, v. 18a

13.3.1.2 *tqwh*, v. 7a
lnṣḥ, v. 20a

13.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

13.3.2.1 *’p*, v. 3a
zh, v. 3a
’nky, v. 15a
tqwh, v. 19c

13.3.2.2 imperative: *š‘h*, v. 6a
imperative*: *ḥdl*, v. 6a
w- beginning line, v. 12a
’k, v. 22a

13.3.3 Contrary indications

h- interr., v. 14a
’nwš, v. 19c

13.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

13.4.1 General survey

’: *’dm*, vv. 1, 10; *’yš*/*’šh*, vv. 1, 12; *’m*, vv. 5, 7, 8, 14; *’p* (‘even’)/*’p* (‘anger’), vv. 3, 13 resp.; *’rṣ*, vv. 8, 19; *’t* (nota accus.)/*’t* (prep.), vv. 3, 5 resp.
b: *b-*, vv. 3, 8, 8, 13, 17; *bw’*, vv. 3, 14
g: *gbr*, vv. 10, 14
h: *-hw*, vv. 20, 20
w: *-w*, vv. 3*, 5 (3×), 6, 6, 7, 8, 8, 10, 18, 20, 21, 22 (4×)
ḥ: *ḥdl*, vv. 6, 7; *ḥlp*, vv. 7, 14; *ḥq*, vv. 5, 13
y: *-y*, vv. 13, 14, 14, 16, 16, 17, 17; *ywm*, vv. 1, 5, 6, 14
k: *k-*, vv. 2, 2, 6, 9; *-k*, vv. 3, 3, 5, 13, 15, 15; *ky*, vv. 7, 16
l: *l-*, vv. 7, 13, 15, 20, 21; *l’*, vv. 2, 4, 5, 7, 12 (3×), 16, 21, 21

m: *-mw*, vv. 9, 21; *mwt*, vv. 8, 10, 14; *my*, vv. 4, 13; *mym*, vv. 9, 11, 19; *mn*, vv. 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 18
n: *-ny*, vv. 13 (3×); *ntn*, vv. 4, 13
s: *spr*, vv. 5, 16
‘: *‘d*, vv. 6, 12, 13, 14; *‘l*, vv. 3, 6, 16, 17, 22, 22; *‘pr*, vv. 8, 19; *‘śh*, vv. 5, 9, 15
q: *qwm*, vv. 12, 18; *qṣr*, vv. 1, 9
š: *šnh* (‘sleep’)/*šnh* (‘to pervert’), vv. 12, 20 resp.

13.4.2 Within the strophes

vv. 4–6: *mn*, vv. 4a.6a—inclusio
ywm, vv. 5a.6b
vv. 7–9: *’m*, vv. 7b.8a
vv. 10–12: *wgbr*/*w’š* (beginn. line), vv. 10a and 12a resp.—inclusio; see also *’dm* in v. 10b
mn, vv. 11a.12c
vv. 13–15: *‘d*, vv. 13b.14c
-k, vv. 13b.15a+b—inclusio
l-, vv. 13c.15b—inclusio
vv. 16–17: *‘l*, vv. 16b.17b
ḥṭ’t/*pš‘* … *‘wn*, vv. 16b and 17 respect.!
vv. 20–22: *l-*, vv. 20a.21b

13.4.3 Within the canticles

vv. 1–6 (I.1): *ywm*, vv. 1b.5a+6b—inclusio
‘l, vv. 3a.6a—linear
pqḥ ‘ynym/*š‘h*, vv. 3a and 6a resp.!—linear
-k, vv. 3a+b.5b
’t/*’t*, vv. 3b and 5b respectively!
vv. 7–12 (I.2): *ymwt*, v. 8b.10a
mn, vv. 9a.11a+12c
mym, vv. 9a.11a
vv. 13–17 (II.1): *b-*, vv. 13a.17a—inclusio
-y, vv. 13c+14b+c.16a+b+17a+b!; see also *-ny* in v. 13a–c!
vv. 18–22 (II.2): *’bnym*/*bnyw*, vv. 19a and 21a resp.—alliteration

13.4.4 Within the cantos

vv. 1–12 (canto I): *’dm*, vv. 1a.10b!—‘inclusio’
’šh/*’yš*, vv. 1a and 12a respectively!—inclusio

qṣr, vv. 1b.9b!—linear
b-, vv. 3b.8a+b—linear
ḥdl, vv. 6a.7c!—concatenatio
‘d, vv. 6b.12b—exactly linear

vv. 13–22 (canto II): *‘l*, vv. 16b+17b.22a+b

13.4.5 Within the composition as a whole

vv. 1–6.13–17: *ywm*, vv. 1b+5a+6b.14b!
’p/’p, vv. 3a and 13b resp.!—linear
-k, vv. 3a+b+5b.13b+15a+b!
bw’, vv. 3b.14c!—linear
my ytn, vv. 4a.13a!
spr, vv. 5b.16a!—linear
ḥq, vv. 5c.13c!
skyr/ṣb’, vv. 6b and 14b respectively; cf. 7,1–2

vv. 7–12.18–22: *tqwh*, vv. 7a.19c!—linear
’rṣ, vv. 8a.19b!—linear
‘pr, vv. 8b.19b!—linear } chiasm
mym, vv. 9a+11a.19a!
-mw, vv. 9b.21b!
wl’ int. // *wl’*, vv. 12.21
qwm, vv. 12a.18b!
mšntm/mšnh, vv. 12c and 20b resp.! (alliteration) —linear

vv. 10–12.13–15, concatenatio: *wgbr ymwt/’m ymwt gbr*, vv. 10a and 14a resp.!—chiasm
‘d, vv. 12b.13b+14c

13.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

13.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
’m, *mn* (v. 18), *l-*

13.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*-hw*), *-w*, *ḥlp*, *k-*, *ky*, *l’*, *‘śh*

13.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...|1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12|13–17.18–22 (...|4×3|5.5)

Stickel (1842): ...|1–6.7–12|13–17.18–22 (...|6.6|5.5)

Schlottmann (1851): ...||13,23–25.26–28.14,1–3||4–6.7–9.10–12||13–15.16–17|18–19.20–22 (...||3.3.3||3.3.3||3.2|2.3)

Ewald (1854): ...|13,23–28.14,1–6.7–12.13–17.18–22 (...|3×6.5.5); cf. Stickel (1842)

Merx (1871): ...1+13,28+14,2b+3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–14.15–17|18–19.20–22 (...4×7.6.6|6.6)

Hitzig (1874): ...||1–6.7–12.13–17.18–22 (...||6.6.5.5); similarly Dillmann (1869); cf. Stickel (1842)

Delitzsch (1876): ...|1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–16.17–19.20–22 (...|6.3×7.10.7.6)

Wright (1883): ...|1–2+13,28+14,3.4a+5–6.7–9.10–12|13–14.15–17.18–20.21–22 (...|8.6.7.7|6.6.7.4)

Dillmann (1891): ...||1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12|13–14.15–17.18–19.20–22 (...||6.6.7.7|6.6.5.6)

Bickell (1894): ...1–2.3+13,28.14,5a–b+6.7*.8–9.10+12*.13–14a.14b–15.16–17

Ley (1895): 1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–14.15–17.18–19.20–22 (8×3)

Duhm (1897): ...|1–2.3–4.5–6|7*.8–9.10+12b–c|13–14a.14b–15|16–17.18–19b.19c+12a+20.21–22

Vetter (1897): ...|1–6|7–9.10–12|13–17|18–22

Müller (1898), pp. 66–71: 1–3.4–6|7–9.10–12|13–17.18–22 (6.6|7.7|11.11; a.a'|b.b'|c.c')

Hontheim (1904): ...||1–6.7–10+13,28+14,12|13–17.18–19+11+20–22 (...|12.12)

Schlögl (1916): ...3–12.13+14b–22 (...22.22)

Ball (1922): ...1–2.x+5a–b.3+6.7*.8–9.10+12b–c.13–14a.14b–15.16–17.18–19a+c.21–22; cf. Hölscher (1952)

Peters (1928): ...|13,28–14,1.2–3.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–17.18–19.20–22 (...|7×2.3.2.3)

König (1929): ...1–12.13–22; similarly Van Selms (1982)

Kissane (1939): ...1–6+13,28.13–17.7–12.18–22 (...6.5.6.5)

Irwin (1946): ...|1–2+13,28.14,3+5–6|7–9.10–12|13+14c.14a–b+15.16–17|18–19.20–22 (...|3.3|3.3|3×2|3.3)

Möller (1955): 13,18–27.28–14,12.13–22 (10.13.10)

Skehan (1961): ...|1–3+13,28.14,4–6.7–9.10–12.13–17.18–22 (...|4.3×3.5.5); similarly NAB (1970); cf. Murphy (1981)

Fohrer (1963): . . . |1–3.4–6.7–9.10–11a+12.13–14.15–17.18–19.20–22 (. . . |8×3); similarly Hesse (1978); cf. Ley (1895)
Terrien (1963): . . . ||1–3.4–6|7–9.10–12|13–15.16–17|18–20.21–22
Horst (1968): 1–2+13,28+14,3+5–6.7–12|13–17.18–22 (6.6|5.5)
Epping-Nelis (1968): . . . |1–2+13,28+14,3.4–6.7–12|13+14b–17|18–22
TOB (1978): . . . |1–6.7–12.13–22
KBS (1980): 1–3.4–12.13–22
De Wilde (1981): . . . |1–2.13,28+14,3.5a–b+6.7*.8–9.10–11.12*|13–14a. 14b–15.16–17|18–19b.19c+5c+20.21–22
Webster (1983): 13,28–14,2.3–6.7–9.10–12.13–17.18–22
Krašovec (1984), pp. 112–15: 7–9 <> 10–12 and 13–17 <> 18–22
Habel (1985): 1.2.3–4.5.6|7–10.11–12.13–17.18–20.21–22
Bezuidenhout (1986): . . . ||1–3.4–6|7–9.10–12|13–17.18–22 (. . . ||3.3|3.3|5.5)
Michel (1987): 1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–17.18–19.20–22
Hartley (1988): . . . |1–6.7–12.13–17.18–22; similarly Weiser (1968)
Clines (1989): . . . 1–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–17.18–22 (. . . 4×3.5.5 [5=3.2])
MacKenzie (1990): . . . |14,1–2+13,28+14,3.4–6.7–9.10–12|13–17.18–22; cf. Skehan (1961)

13.6 Comments and summary

We can observe some agreement among scholars as to the division of ch. 14 into four almost identical units: vv. 1–6 ('Die Vergänglichkeit des Menschen und Gottes Gericht'), 7–12 ('Die Hoffnungslosigkeit des Todesschicksals'), 13–17 ('Ein Hoffnungsstrahl?'), 18–22 ('der zerschlagene Hoffnung').[1] On the basis of an analysis in terms of content ch. 14 actually divides primarily into these four units. Next, I note that the ideas of these units match each other in a parallel way. That is to say, there is a thematic correspondence between the first and the third unit; both refer to *God's judgement* (note vv. 3/6 and 15a). The second and fourth units (vv. 7–12 and 18–22) make it clear that there is *no hope* for a human being after death; note *tqwh* ('hope') in anal. 13.4.5. So a higher structural level can be discerned in this poem apart from the skeleton of the units discussed: the poem also divides into two major units of relatively equal length, vv. 1–12 and 13–22.[2] The major units vv. 1–12 and 13–22 are the cantos, vv. 1–6 etc. represent the canticles.

---

[1] So Stickel, Ewald, Dillmann (1869), Hitzig, Vetter, Irwin, Terrien, Horst, Weiser, Hartley; cf. Müller, Hontheim, Kissane, Epping-Nelis (see anal. 13.5). The descriptive phrases are Weiser's.

[2] So also Köster, Stickel, Wright, Dillmann (1891), Hontheim, König, Horst, Van Selms, MacKenzie; cf. also Schlögl and Möller.

Habel describes ch. 14 as an 'artistic culmination' of the first cycle of discourses.[3] He divides the poem into vv. 1–6 and 7–22. These major units are supposed to exhibit broadly similar structures. At the pivot of these Job reverts to the theme of litigation (vv. 3–4 and 13–17; pp. 235-36). Habel's design, however,[4] does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the structure of this poem because vv. 3–4 do not represent the pivotal lines of vv. 1–6. The idea of v. 3 about God's watching his creatures (see especially v. 3a) matches the thought of v. 6a (note anal. 13.4.3; so correctly Smick). And the idea of v. 4 about man's uncleanness[5] corresponds to the thought of v. 1a (cf. for *ylwd 'šh* 15,14 and 25,4†). These thematic connections point to a *linear* parallelism between vv. 1–3 and 4–6 (*parallelismus stropharum*; similarly Bezuidenhout, p. 152). Habel's design reflects an overestimation of the importance of the 'palistrophe' (cf. p. 46) in Hebrew poetry. According to Van Selms the first line of ch. 14 formulates two themes, the brevity and the turmoil of life, which are successively elaborated in vv. 2–12 and 13–22. This structural approach does no justice to the specific character of the canticles I.1 and II.1 (see below, about the quintessential thought of the poem).

Apart from the verbal repetition formed by the noun *tqwh*, mentioned above, the rhetorical framework of this poem on the level of the cantos and the canticles is fixed by many other responsions; see especially anal. 13.4.5. It is obvious once more that the Hebrew poets consciously aimed at framing the overall structure of their compositions in a formal way with the help of the rhetorical device of external, repetitive parallelism. The positions of the expression *my ytn* ('if only'; at the very beginning of vv. 4 and 13) and the noun *ḥq* ('limit'; in the third colon of vv. 5 and 13) clearly demonstrate that they did not always make use of verbal repetitions in an exactly linear way. In the second canticles of the cantos (I.2 and II.2) there is a striking cluster of verbal repetitions within the *first* strophes of the corresponding units, vv. 7–9 and 18–19 (anal. 13.4.5).

The cantos are also bound together by an obvious concatenatio; see *wgbr ymwt* and *'m ymwt gbr* in vv. 10 and 14 resp. (anal. 13.4.5). Skehan rightly assumes that the poem of ch. 14 is of 'alphabetic' length. The poem in its entirety encompasses 22 lines.[6] That we are dealing with a consciously structured, quasi-alphabetic poem is corroborated by the first characters of the first and the last words: note *'dm* in v. 1 and *t'bl* in v. 22.[7]

---

[3] Cf. Andersen (p. 171): 'The author's poetic artistry reaches one of its highest points in this elegy'.

[4] Cf. also Andersen (p. 170) and E.B. Smick, 'Architectonics' (1986), p. 89: vv. 2.3.4.5.6 > a.b.c.a'.b'.

[5] Cf. J. Ziegler, *Iob 14,4–5a, als wichtigster Schriftbeweis für die These "Neminem sine sorde et sine peccato esse" (Cyprian, test 3, 54) bei den lateinischen christlichen Schriftstellern*, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985.

[6] According to Skehan the poem encompasses 23 lines, because he incorporates 13,28

Advocates of strophic structure generally agree that the first main part of the poem is built up out of an uninterrupted sequence of three-line strophes.[8] From v. 16 onwards, however, this regular structure is interrupted by two 2-line strophes (see Schlottmann; and cf. Terrien and Clines).[9] This strophic structure is in the first place indicated by the analysis of the flow of the content (anal. 13.2); note also the parallelism between vv. 1–3 and 4–6 pointed out above. The analysis of the transition markers (anal. 13.3.1–2) also supports this framework on the level of the strophes. The analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the strophes further reveals some fine inclusions (see anal. 13.4.2).

The *quintessential thought* of the poem is in the first place formulated in the *first strophes* of the cantos. The strophes refer to the legal proceedings between Job and God and express Job's conclusion that *God's concern to punish sin is disproportionate* (Clines). This conclusion is founded by canticles I.2 and II.2 and most explicitly and tersely formulated in the pivotal cola of ch. 14, v. 12a–b:[10] *there is no hope for a human being after death.*[11]

The rhetorical analysis of chs. 12–14, Job's first reply to Zophar, on the one hand points to the unity of the speech, on the other hand, however,

---

within this chapter; similarly Peters. In the first speech-cycle we also find 'poems' of alphabetic length in 6,2–23 (22 lines; Skehan) and ch. 10 (22 lines; Skehan)—all spoken by Job. Compositions of alphabetic length probably demarcate the beginning and the end of the third cycle of speeches; see ch. 27 (22 lines; Peters), and 40,15–41,3 (22 lines) and 41,4–26 (23 lines; cf. ch. 7). See for the Elihu-speeches 33,8–30 (23 lines) and 36,26–37,13 (22 lines); cf. part I, 4.4 (note n. 15) and further C. Schedl, 'Die alphabetisch-arithmetische Struktur von Psalm cxxxvi', *VT* 36 (1986), pp. 489–94.

[7] Skehan, pp. 107–08!; cf. Job 5,8–26 (see anal. 4.6 above) and Ps. 1.

[8] So Köster, Schlottmann, Ley, Irwin, Fohrer, Terrien, Clines; cf. Merx, Delitzsch, Dillmann (1891), Müller, Skehan, MacKenzie (anal. 13.5).

[9] Against Ley and Fohrer; cf. also Irwin. The strophes of the second canto form two identical canticles of five lines (Köster, Schlottmann, Skehan, Terrien, Clines, a.o.).

[10] There are 24 cola that precede and 24 cola that follow v. 12a–b. These 24 (=2×12) cola also comprise 84 (=7×12) words each.

[11] Compared with 13,15–16, this is a regression indeed to Job's earlier hopelessness and not a 'radical new dream' (Habel). Cf. also B. van 't Veld, *De klacht over de vergankelijkheid van het menselijk leven in het Oude Testament tegen de achtergrond van andere Oudtestamentische en oud-oosterse uitspraken inzake de vergankelijkheid*, Diss. Utrecht: Selbstverlag des Verf.s, 1985. On the basis of the concentric arrangement of ideas in this poem Andersen and Habel conclude that 'Job gives clear expression to the belief that, even after he lies down in Sheol, God will call him out into life again' (Andersen, p. 169; see vv. 14–17).

supports the view that this reply is made up of three relatively independent poems, each dealing with a special subject. The dimensions of these poems are exactly indicated by the chapter division (cf. anal. 11.6 above).

The unity of the speech is formally expressed by the cantos of twelve lines, which we find in each poem: in chs. 12 and 13 two 12-line cantos, and in ch. 14 one 12-line canto. The second line of ch. 13 obviously mirrors the second line of ch. 12 (see especially *l’ npl ’nky mkm*). The noun *ḥkmh*, which turns up as the final word of 13,5, is found in the same position within the first canto of ch. 12 (v. 2b, final word of the first line of the canto). Moreover, the noun *ḥkmh* demarcates this first canto by inclusio. See also the root *ṣdq* in 13,18 and 12,4. The last line of ch. 13 (v. 28), in which the subject switches from the first to the third person, introduces the following poem about the fragility of *all mankind*; cf. Gordis, p. 146. And the theme of *fragility*, which is dealt with in ch. 14, is an elaboration of an idea touched on in 13,25 and 28 (cf. Clines). The expression *my ytn*, characterizing the first and the fourth canticle of ch. 14 (note the beginning of II.1), we also find in ch. 13 at the very beginning of canto II (v. 5). Next, the seemingly insignificant compound-word *wl’*, which frames the poem of ch. 14 (responsio at the end of the cantos), also plays an important part in the formal skeleton of ch. 12 (inclusio in canto II; note *’yš* (...) *wl’* in 14,12 and 12,14). The form *’yḥl* in 14,14 obviously refers to the same form in 13,15 (cf. also 6,11). The combination of the root *qr’* + *w’nky* + the root *‘nh* we only come across in the book of Job in 14,15 and 13,22 (cf. also 12,4). Cf. furthermore *ṣ‘dy* ... *tšmwr* in 14,16 with *tšmwr* ... *’rḥwty* in 13,27 (chiasm), and *pš‘* ... *‘wn* in 14,17 with *‘wn* ... *pš‘* in 13,23 (chiasm again). The root *ṯpl* does not occur in the book of Job, excepting in 14,17 and 13,4.[12] And it is probably not by accident that the root *ḥqq*/*ḥqh*, which frames the poem of ch. 14 (vv. 5 and 13), is also found in the third (!) colon of the penultimate line of ch. 13 (see *ttḥqh* in v. 27c).[13]

These connections, however, only represent the hinges keeping together the triptych, which is formed by the successive poems of Job’s reply. The independence of these poems is expressed by another series of formal indications. I note the following phenomena:

(a) The 12-line cantos in each chapter exhibit their own, characteristic structure. In ch. 12 they consist of a combination of two- and three-line strophes, which are grouped into a symmetrical pattern of canticles (5.7|7.5); in ch. 13 the cantos totally consist of two-line strophes, which in

---

[12] See further Ps. 119,69†.

[13] For the root *ḥqq* in the book of Job see further 19,23 23,12.14 26,10 28,26 38,10.33. Cf. also *‘br* in 14,5 and 13,13, *str* in 14,13 and 13,10.20.24, *w’wlm* in 14,18 and 13,4, *bśr* ... *npš* in 14,22 and 13,14 (Fokkelman).

pairs form canticles of four lines; and in ch. 14 the 12-line canto is built up of a series of three-line strophes, which in pairs form canticles of six lines.
(b) The caesura between chs. 12 and 13 is indicated by a four-line, introductory canto at the beginning of ch. 13.
(c) In ch. 12 the rhetorical device of inclusio plays an important part in delimiting the cantos. In the following chapters the verbal repetitions at the level of the cantos and the poem as a whole primarily display a linear pattern.
(d) The roots *šm'* and *'zn* and the particle *n'*, in particular, which we meet with in ch. 13 to demarcate the beginning of the cantos, are specifically connected with the formal framework of just this poem. Outside ch. 13, we come across the root *'zn* only in 12,11, and the particle *n'* only in 12,7, that is to say at positions in ch. 12 which are not characteristic of the canto structure of the poem. In ch. 14 these words do not occur at all.

The nouns *ywm* ('day'), *mym* ('water'), *tqwh* ('hope'; root *qwh*) and the root *spr* ('to count'), in particular, which determine the canto structure of ch. 14, do not occur in the preceding poem of ch. 13. The expression *qṣr ymym* ('short-lived') in 14,1 is a correcting allusion to *'rk ymym* ('long-lived') in 12,12; see for *mym* also 12,15 and for *spr* also 12,8.

PART III

The Second Speech-Cycle (Job 15–26) and Job 40,1–5

1 Eliphaz’s second speech (1): Job 15,2–16

Structure: 5.5.5 > 2.3|2.3|2.3

I	[2]	*HḤKM* **y‘nh** *d‘t RWḤ*	*wyml’ qdym bṭnw*
	[3]	*hwkḥ bdbr l’ yskwn*	*wMLYM l’ yw‘yl bm*
	[4]	*’P ’th tpr yr’h*	*wtgr‘ śyḥh lpny ’L*
	[5]	*ky y’lp ‘wnk pyk*	*wtbḥr lšwn ‘rwmym*
	[6]	*yršy‘k pyk WL’ ’ny*	*wśptyk* **y‘nw** *bk*
II	[7]	*Hr’yšwn ’dm twld*	*wlpny gb‘wt ḥwllt*
	[8]	*Hbswd ’LWH tšm‘*	*wtgr‘ ’lyk ḤKMH*
	[9]	*MH yd‘t WL’ nd‘*	*tbyn WL’ ‘mnw hw’*
	[10]	*gm śb gm yšyš bnw*	*kbyr m’byk ymym*
	[11]	**h***m‘ṭ mmk tnḥmwt ’L*	*wdbr l’ṭ ‘mk*
III	[12]	**mh** *yqḥk lbk*	*w***mh** *yrzmwn* **‘yny***k*
	[13]	*ky tšyb ’l ’L RWḤk*	*whṣ’t mpyk MLYN*
	[14]	*MH ’nwš ky yzkh*	*wky yṣdq ylwd ’šh*
	[15]	*hn bqdšw l’ y’myn*	*wšmym l’ zkw b***‘ynyw**
	[16]	*’P ky nt‘b wn’lḥ*	*’yš šth kmym ‘wlh*

1.1 Text

V. 15a—*bqdšw*: so K (script. def.?); Q *bqdšyw*.

1.2 Content

Condemnation of Job's words (negative).

- I Announcement of the themes:
    - A wise man does not speak out of such arrogant stupidity (about mankind in general, vv. 2–3; see canto II).
    - Your speech, however, is impious and contradictory (vv. 4–6; see canto III).
- II Job's stupidity (cf. vv. 2–3).
    - You must not imagine that you have more knowledge of and a deeper insight in God's plans (vv. 7–8)
    - than we have, who intend to comfort you (vv. 9–11).
- III Job's godless talk (cf. vv. 4–6).
    - You are too much carried away by your emotions (vv. 12–13).
    - A wicked person cannot justify himself before God after all! (about mankind in general, vv. 14–16; cf. vv. 2–3).

1.3 Transition markers

1.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

1.3.1.1 *h-* interr., v. 2a
'th, v. 4a
h- interr., v. 7a; ext. // *h-* interr. in v. 8a
mh, v. 9a
hw', v. 9b
mh, v. 12a
mh, v. 12b
mh, v. 14a
'nwš, v. 14a

1.3.1.2 *'p*, v. 4a

1.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

1.3.2.1 *'p*, v. 16a

1.3.2.2 *'ny*, v. 6a
h- interr., v. 11a

1.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

gm, v. 10a (2×)
hn, v. 15a

1.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

1.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’l* (prep.), vv. 8, 13; *’l* (God)/*’lwh*, vv. 4, 8 (*’lwh*), 11, 13; *’p* (‘even’), vv. 4, 16; *’yš*/*’šh*, vv. 14, 16 (cf. *’dm* in v. 7 and *’nwš* in v. 14)
b: *b-*, vv. 3, 3, 6, 8, 10, 15, 15
g: *gm*, vv. 10, 10; *gr‘*, vv. 4, 8
d: *dbr*, vv. 3, 11
h: *h-* interr., vv. 2, 7, 8, 11
w: *-w*, vv. 2, 15, 15
z: *zkh*, vv. 14, 15
ḥ: *ḥkm*, vv. 2, 8
y: *yd‘*, vv. 2, 9, 9; *yld*, vv. 7, 14
k: *-k*, vv. 5, 5, 6 (4×), 8, 10, 11, 11, 12 (3×), 13, 13; *ky*, vv. 5, 13, 14, 14, 16
l: *l-*, vv. 4, 7; *l’*, vv. 3, 3, 6, 9, 9, 15, 15
m: *mh*, vv. 9, 12, 12, 14; *mlh*, vv. 3, 13; *mn*, vv. 10, 11, 13
n: *-nw*, vv. 9, 10
‘: *‘yn*, vv. 12, 15; *‘nh*, vv. 2, 6
p: *ph*, vv. 5, 6, 13; *pnh*, vv. 4, 7
r: *rwḥ*, vv. 2, 13

1.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *hḥkm*/*hwkḥ*, vv. 2a and 3a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
wyml’/*wmlym l’*, vv. 2b and 3b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
vv. 4–6: *pyk*, vv. 5a.6a
vv. 7–8: *h-* interr., vv. 7a.8a—exactly linear
vv. 9–11: *-nw*, vv. 9b.10a!
mn, vv. 10b.11a
vv. 14–16: *zkh*, vv. 14a.15b!; see also *ṣdq* in v. 14b
’šh/*’yš*, vv. 14b.16b!—inclusio; see also *’nwš* in v. 14a
š sound, vv. 14a+b.15a+b.16b (2×)

1.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–6 (canto I): *‘nh*, vv. 2a.6b!—inclusio
b-, vv. 3a+b.6b—linear; note *bm* in v. 3b and *bk* in v. 6b—exactly linear
l’, vv. 3a+b.6a—linear

vv. 7–11 (canto II): *h-* interr., vv. 7a+8a.11a—inclusio
’lwh/’l, vv. 8a.11a—linear

vv. 12–16 (canto III): *mh*, vv. 12a.14a—exactly linear; see also v. 12b
‘ynym, vv. 12b.15b!

1.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–3.7–8.12–13: *h-* interr., vv. 2a.7a—exactly linear; see also v. 8a
ḥkm, vv. 2a.8b!
y‘nh/‘ynyk, vv. 2a and 12b resp. (alliter.)—linear
rwḥ, vv. 2a.13a!
mlh, vv. 3b.13b!—linear
’lwh/’l, vv. 8a and 13a respectively—linear
’l (prep.), vv. 8b.13a!—linear

vv. 4–6.9–11.14–16: *’p*, vv. 4a.16a!
’l (God), vv. 4b.11a
‘wn/‘wlh, vv. 5a and 16b respectively
wl’, vv. 6a.9a+b!; see also *l’* in vv. 15a+b
mh, vv. 9a.14a—exactly linear

In the first line of the strophes: *yd‘*, vv. 2a.9a (2×)!
lpny, vv. 4b.7b!
yld, vv. 7a.14b!
mh, vv. 9a.12a+b.14a!

In the last line of the strophes: *dbr*, vv. 3a.11b!
pyk, vv. 6a.13b; see also v. 5a!
mn, vv. 11a.13b; see also v. 10b!

1.4.5 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

1.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration

b-, *-k*, *l-*

1.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration

(*gm*), *gr‘*, *-w*, *ky*

1.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–6.7–11.12–16|... (3×5|...); similarly Ley (1895), Kissane (1939), MacKenzie (1990)
Stickel (1842): 2–6|7–10.11–16|... (5|4.6|...)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–6.7–11.12–16|... (2.2.1|2.2.1|2.2.1||...)
Ewald (1854): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11 13.14 16.17–19|... (2.3.4|3.3.3||...)
Merx (1871): 2–4.5–6.7–8.9–10|11–13.14–16... (6.4.4.4|6.6...)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–6.7–10.11–13.14–16... (10.8.6.6...)
Wright (1883): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–13.14–16... (4.6.8.6.6...); cf. Ewald (1854)
Dillmann (1891): 2–6.7–11.12–16|... (10.10.10|...)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.4–5.7–8.9+11.12–13.15–16...
Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5.7–8.9–10.11–12.6+13.14–15.16–17.18–19|...
Vetter (1897): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–10|11–13.14–16|...
Hontheim (1904): 2–6.7–11|12–16|... (5.5|5|...)
Schlögl (1916): 2–6.7–11.12–16... (10.10.10...)
Ball (1922): 2–3.4–5.7–8.9–10.11+13.15–16...
Peters (1928): 2–3.4–6.7–8.9–10.11–13.14–16|... (2.3.2.2.3.3|...); cf. Vetter (1897)
König (1929): 2–6.7–16...
Irwin (1946): 2–3.4–5.7–8.9–10|11–13.14–16.17–19|... (4×2|3×3|...)
Möller (1955): 2–3.4–11.12–19... (2.8.8...)
Skehan (1961): 2–6.7–11.12–16... (5.5.5...); cf. KBS (1980)
Fohrer (1963): 2–6.7–10.11–13.14–16|... (5.4.3.3|...); cf. Delitzsch (1876)
Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–6|7–8.9–11|12–13.14–16; ...
Horst (1968): 2–6.7–10.11–16; ... (5.4.6; ...); cf. Stickel (1842)
TOB (1978): 2–6.7–13.14–16|...
De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.7–8.9–10.11–12.6+13.14–16|...; cf. Duhm (1897)
Van Selms (1982): 2–10.11–16|...
Webster (1983): 2–6.7–10.11 13.14–16; ...; cf. Fohrer (1963), Horst (1968) and Delitzsch (1876)
Habel (1985), pp. 248–49: 2–3.4–6.7–11.12–13.14–16|... (a.b.c.b'.a'|...; cf., however, also pp. 249–50)
Clines (1989): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–13.14–16|... (2.3.4.3.3|...); cf. Wright (1883) and Bezuidenhout (1986)

1.6 Comments and summary

The second speech of Eliphaz in the layout of our present Hebrew text fills only one chapter. Scholars generally agree, however, that ch. 15 divides into two major sections (cf. Eliphaz's first speech, Job 4-5) and that on the basis of the material content the first section ends in v. 16. In my opinion, each of the two major sections represents a relatively independent poem.[1] In the first section Eliphaz condemns Job's foolish and godless talk. The beginning of the second section of this chapter (vv. 17–35) is indicated by the introductory unit of vv. 17–19. In this second section Eliphaz describes the fate of the wicked, who are severely punished. The rhetorical analysis of the poems concerned also corroborates this view.

As anal. 1.5 above shows there is some tradition among critics to divide 15,2–16 into three units of (relatively) equal length. Opinions differ, however, about the correct position of the second break. Thus we come across two interpretations of the tripartite structure: vv. 2–6, 7–11, 12-16, three identical units;[2] and vv. 2-6, 7–10, 11–16.[3] According to Horst v. 11 must be the beginning of the 'last' unit because 'die vorgehaltenen Fragen auf die zu treffenden Feststellungen hinstreben und auf sie das Aussagegewicht lagern wollen.[4] V. 11, however, belongs to the preceding lines because this verse like vv. 9–10 deals with Job's estimation *of the friends'* wise and comforting words (note v. 11b); see also the prep. *mn* in anal. 1.4.2. V. 11 is connected with the 'indirect charges of arrogant claims to knowledge' we also find in vv. 7–8 and 9–10 (so Habel).

Schlottmann already excellently described the internal relations in terms of content between vv. 2–6, 7–11, 12–16. In this poem, according to Schlottmann, Eliphaz puts two questions to Job: (a) 'Wie kannst du ... mit deinen leeren und leidenschaftlichen Behauptungen den Besitz der höchsten Weisheit uns gegenüber beanspruchen?'; and (b) 'Wie kannst du es wagen, allen unseren Einwendungen zu Trotz deine vermessenen Anklagen gegen den heiligen und almächtigen Gott zu wiederholen?' (p. 300). That is to say, Eliphaz questions Job about his wisdom and about his religion. Next, Schlottmann points out that both questions are touched upon in the first unit (vv. 2–6; cf. anal. 1.2). The second unit (vv. 7–11) then goes into the first question ('worauf stützt sich dein Anspruch auf die höchste Weisheit uns gegenüber, deren Tröstungen du verschmähst?'; cf. vv. 2–3), and the third unit (vv. 12–16) goes into the second question ('wie kannst du sündiger Mensch mit Gott hadern, vor dem die Engel nich rein sind?'; cf. vv. 4–6).[5] This structural approach partly goes along with Habel's (first) description of the design of 15,2–16 (see pp. 249–50). In the context of this design Habel also points out the relationship between vv. 4/5–6 and 12–13 ('direct accusations of perverse speech'/'erosion of traditional religion'). According to his first design vv. 7–11 also form a close, thematic unity: 'indirect charges of arrogant claims to knowledge'.

---

[1] So Terrien, Weiser, Horst, Webster; see also the dichotomy of this poem with Dillmann, Ley, Hontheim (p. 156), Peters, Kissane, Fohrer, TOB, De Wilde, Van Selms (pp. 139–40), Habel, Clines, MacKenzie (anal. 1.5). Earlier scholars like Ewald, Wright and Duhm divided ch. 15 into vv. 2–19 and 20–35. According to Schlottmann vv. 17–19 represent a 'Zwischenglied' (cf. Horst); see also Köster, Irwin and Möller in anal. 1.5.

[2] So Köster, Schlottmann, Ley, Dillmann, Hontheim, Schlögl, Kissane, Skehan, Terrien, KBS.

[3] So Stickel, Vetter, Epping-Nelis, Horst, Rozelaar; 'drei Gefüge von ungleicher Länge' (Horst). Cf. for the main break behind v. 10 also Delitzsch, Irwin, Fohrer, Van Selms, Webster.

[4] Horst divides vv. 11–16 into two 3-line sub-units: vv. 11–13 and 14–16; so also Webster, pp. 44–45 (cf. Ewald, Merx, Delitzsch, Wright, Vetter, Peters, Irwin, Fohrer, Webster and Clines).

This analysis of the train of thought in 15,2–16 is supported by special patterns of verbal repetition, which dominate the canto stucture of the poem. We primarily come across these verbal repetitions in the first strophes of the cantos (vv. 2–3, 7–8 and 12–13). I point to the following phenomena; see anal. 1.4.4: The first and the second cantos are both introduced by the interrogative particle *h-* (vv. 2a and 7a). The root *ḥkm* ('to be wise', v. 2a) is repeated in the second line of canto II (v. 8b). The last word in the first colon of canto I, *rwḥ* ('wind, spirit', v. 2a), is repeated in the second line of canto III (v. 13a). The noun *mlh* ('word'), second line of canto I (v. 3b), is repeated in the second line of canto III (v. 13b). We come across the preposition *ʾl* in the second line of cantos II and III (vv. 8b and 13a). This interpretation of the framing function of the verbal repetitions is perfectly in accordance with the analysis of the structure of the poem in terms of content. Therefore I find this approach more appropriate than Habel's presentation of the 'balanced repetition of thematic features'. On the basis of this supposed balance Habel is forced to put a main caesura between vv. 8 and 9.[6] The inclusio which is formed by the repetition of *h-* interrogative at the beginning of the first and the last lines of canto II (vv. 7a, 8a and 11a) once again supports my view about the unity of vv. 7–11; cf. the inclusio around the first canto formed by the repetition of the root *ʿnh* ('to answer', vv. 2a and 6b); anal. 1.4.3.

Each of these cantos is constructed of a two- and a three-line strophe. The thematic demarcation in the first canto, vv. 2–3 and 4–6,[7] is already stated by the main themes of the poem. The first two lines also distinguish themselves from the following by the fact that they deal with wisdom of mankind in general. From v. 4 onwards Eliphaz deals with Job in particular. See also *'th* and *'p* in anal. 1.3.1. In the final canto (vv. 12–16) the situation is reversed. In the first two lines (vv. 12–13) Eliphaz describes Job's sinful attitude towards God, and in vv. 14–16 the uncleanness before God of all mankind (cf. 4,17–19); see for vv. 14–16 also anal. 1.4.2 and *mh* in anal. 1.4.3. In the second canto as a whole Eliphaz entirely focuses on the person of Job. So, the opening and the closing strophe of this poem, which deal with mankind in general, delimitate the poem by a thematic inclusio; so also Habel, pp. 248–49. In the first two lines of canto II (vv. 7–8) Eliphaz attacks Job's alleged, divine wisdom. These lines distinguish themselves from the following ones because vv. 9–11 deal with Job's wisdom in contrast with the wisdom of the friends; cf. above about the dimensions of canto II. Note also *mh* and *hw'* in v. 9 (anal. 1.3.1.1); cf. *mh* in vv. 12 and 14.[8]

---

[5] Schlottmann, pp. 299 and 301; cf. anal. 1.2.

[6] See p. 249. This analysis focuses on the following thematic terms: *ydʿ* (vv. 2 and 9), *ʾl* ('God', vv. 4 and 11), *ph* (vv. 5–6 and 13), *yld* (vv. 7 and 14). In my opinion, these verbal repetitions are only of minor importance to establish the thought pattern of the poem. By attaching greater value to the root *ḥkm* (see above) it also becomes clear that Eliphaz is 'responding to Job's prior claims to knowledge'; cf. the 'key-word' *ḥkmh* in 12,2–13. Cf. in this context also 12,12 and 15,10; note *yšyš* and *ymym*.

[7] So also Ewald, Wright, Vetter, Peters and Clines.

The *quintessential thought* of the poem is in fact represented by the composition in its entirety. As pointed out above, however, the main theme is most tersely formulated in the first canto: *Eliphaz accuses Job of being unwise and godless.* Vv. 2 and 6 may function as the nodal verses of the poem; note the root *'nh* ('to answer') in vv. 2a and 6b. With his first accusation Eliphaz reacts to Job's claims to knowledge in the beginning of chs. 12 and 13. Eliphaz's second accusation is directed to Job's claims that he is righteous (ch. 13) and that God's punishment of sins is disproportionate (ch. 14).

This rhetorical analysis, in my view, is supported by some striking similarities which now emerge between this first poem of Eliphaz's speech and the first poem of Eliphaz's speech in ch. 4–5. Both poems (chs. 4 and 15,2–16) consist of five-line units. Most of these units are marked off by inclusio (4,2–6, 7–11, 17–21 and 15,2–6, 7–11). The inclusio which is formed by *h*-interr. in 15,7–11 exactly corresponds to the inclusions of 4,2–6 and 17–21. In ch. 4 the noun *dbr* plays an important part on the level of the skeleton of the poem as a whole; cf. *mlym(/n)* in 15,2–16. Finally, there is of course the resemblance between 4,17–19 and 15,14–16. However, it is of noteworthy in this context, that there is a more exact correspondence between 15,14–16 and 25,4–6 than between 15,14–16 and 4,17–19.[9] Note *mh* in 15,14 and 25,4, the root *zkh* ('to be pure') in 15,14–15 and 25,4, *ylwd 'šh* in 15,14 and 25,4, *b'ynyw* in 15,15 and 25,5, *'p ky* in 15,16 and 25,6. The interrogative particle *mh* ('what'?) and the noun *'ynym* ('eyes') perfectly fit the formal framework of our poem; see anal. 1.4.3–4.

---

[8] See Terrien in anal. 1.5.

[9] Cf. part VII, 1.3 below.

2 Eliphaz’s second speech (2): Job 15,17–35

Structure: 3 8.8 > 3 4.4|4.4 > 3 2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2

A	17	*’ḥwk šm‘ ly*	*wzh ḥzyty W’SPRH*	
	18	*’ŠR ḥkmym ygydw*	*WL’ KḤDW m’bwtm*	
	19	*lhm lbdm ntnh h’RṢ*	*WL’ ‘br zr btwkm*	
I.1	20	*kl* YMY *RŠ‘* HW’ *mtḥwll*	*WMSPR šnym nṣpnw l‘RYṢ*	
	21	*qwl pḥdym b’znyw*	*bšlwm šwdd ybw’nw*	
	22	*L’ Y’MYN šwb MNY ḤŠK*	*wṣpw* HW’ *’ly ḥrb*	
	23	*ndd* HW’ *llḥm ’yh*	*yd‘ KY nkwn bydw* YWM *ḤŠK*	
I.2	24	*yb‘thw ṣr wmṣwqh*	*ttqphw Kmlk ‘tyd lkydwr*	
	25	KY *nṭh ’l ’l ydw*	*w’l šdy ytgbr*	
	26	*yrwṣ ’lyw bṣw’r*	*b‘by gby mgnyw*	
	27	*KY ksh pnyw bḥlbw*	*wy‘ś pymh ‘ly ksl*	
II.1	28	*wyškwn ‘rym NKḤDWT*	*btym l’ yšbw lmw*	*’ŠR ht‘tdw lglym*
	29	*l’ y‘šr WL’ yqwm ḥylw*	*WL’ yṭh l’RṢ mnlm*	
	30	*L’ yswr MNY ḤŠK*	*ynqtw tybš šlhbt*	*wyswr brwḥ pyw*
	31	*’l Y’MN bšw nt‘h*	*KY šw’ thyh tmwrtw*	
II.2	32	*bl’ ywmw tml’*	*wkptw l’ r‘nnh*	
	33	*yḥms Kgpn bsrw*	*wyšlk Kzyt nṣtw*	
	34	*KY ‘dt ḤNP glmwd*	*w’š ’klh ’hly šḥd*	
	35	*hrh ‘ml wyld ’wn*	*wbṭnm tkyn mrmh*	

2.1 Text

V. 18b: many scholars suggest to read *wl’ kḥdwm ’bwtm* (‘and from whom their fathers did not hide [it]’); so Hölscher, Gordis, De Wilde, Habel, Clines, among others—cf. also Horst. Driver, however, points out that in Isa. 3,9 *wl’ kḥdw* goes with and strengthens *ygydw*; cf. v. 18a. With Dhorme (Kroeze, Van Selms) I take *m’bwtm* as ‘according to the tradition of their fathers’; cf. also NJPS.

V. 23b—*ywm ḥšk*: many critics transfer these words to the beginning of v.

24 (following LXX), because they are supposed to make v. 23b too long (Duhm, Fohrer, Pope, Habel, Hartley, Clines, a.o.). Analyses 2.4.2 and 2.4.5, however, show that the verse division of MT perfectly fits the formal skeleton of the vv. 20–35; cf. also Gordis.

V. 29b—*mnlm*: 'unerklärt' (Horst). HAL (Hartley, Clines) takes it as a noun *mnwl* ('possession') + suff. 3 pl., following Dahood. This explanation was already given by Schultens ('prosperitas eorum').

Vv. 30a and 31: sometimes these cola are taken as glosses (Duhm, Fohrer, Horst, [Clines]). However, my analyses show that we are dealing with a substantial element within the structure of the original composition; see anal. 2.6.

V. 32a—*tml'*: it is not evident which is the (feminine) subject of this verb form.

2.2 Content

Instruction (positive): the miserable fate of the wicked.

- A Introduction: I will tell you what I know and is based on wisdom tradition (vv. 17–19).
- I The anguish of the wicked man for his destruction because of his rebellion against God.
    - I.1 A godless man is continuously anxious about his *destruction.*
        - A wicked person constantly finds himself in anguish (vv. 20–21).
        - He knows that his destruction is at hand (vv. 22–23).
    - I.2 The root of his fate: his rebellious attitude towards God (*metaphor* of the warrior).
        - Distress and anguish overwhelm him (v. 24) because he behaves rebelliously towards God (vv. 25–27).
- II The self-kindled destruction of the wicked.
    - II.1 Objective description of the wicked man's *destruction.*
        - The wicked man does not gain a firm foothold in civilization (vv. 28–29).
        - Finally, his destruction is inescapable (vv. 30–31).
    - II.2 The root of his fate: his destruction is self-occasioned (*metaphorical* description—cf. also v. 30b).
        - Before he has flourished, the signs of decline are already visible (image of the tree; vv. 32–33).
        - The ruin of the wicked man is caused by his sinful way of life (image of infertility and pregnancy; vv. 34–35).

2.3 Transition markers

2.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

2.3.1.1 cohortative: *’ḥwk*, v. 17a
imperative: *šmʻ*, v. 17a
cohortative: *’sprh*, v. 17b
hw’, v. 20a
hw’, v. 22b; ext. // *hw’* in v. 23a
w- beginning line, v. 28a

2.3.1.2 *zh*, v. 17b
kl ymy, v. 20a
ršʻ, v. 20a

2.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

2.3.2.1 *’l* (prohib.), v. 31a

2.3.2.2 *’yh*, v. 23a

2.3.3 Contrary indications

no remarks

2.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

2.4.1 General survey

’: *’l* (prep.), vv. 25, 25, 26; *’mn*, vv. 22, 31; *’rṣ*, vv. 19, 29; *’šr*, vv. 18, 28
b: *b-*, vv. 19, 21, 21, 23, 26, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32
h: *-hw*, vv. 24, 24; *hw’*, vv. 20, 22, 23
w: *-w*, vv. 21, 23, 25, 26, 26, 27, 27, 29, 30, 30, 31, 32, 32, 33, 33
ḥ: *ḥšk*, vv. 22, 23, 30
y: *yd*, vv. 23, 25; *ywm*, vv. 20, 23, 32
k: *k-*, vv. 24, 33, 33; *kwn*, vv. 23, 35; *kḥd*, vv. 18, 28; *ky*, vv. 23, 25, 27, 31, 34
l: *l-*, vv. 17, 19, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 28, 29; *l’*, vv. 18, 19, 22, 28, 29 (3×), 30, 32, 32
m: *-m*, vv. 18, 19, 19, 29*, 35; *mny*, vv. 18 (*mn*), 22, 30
n: *nṭh*, vv. 25, 29
s: *swr*, vv. 30, 30; *spr*, vv. 17, 20
ʻ: *ʻtd*, vv. 24, 28
š: *šw(’)*, vv. 31, 31

2.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 17–19: *wl’*, vv. 18b.19b—exactly linear
m’bwtm/btwkm, vv. 18b and 19b resp. (allit.)—linear
-m (suff. 3 pl. masc.), vv. 18b.19b—exactly linear; see also v. 19a
vv. 20–21: *ḥyl/pḥd*, vv. 20a and 21a resp.; cf. Job 25,2 and 26,5 resp.
vv. 22–23: *ḥšk*, vv. 22a.23b
hw’, vv. 22b.23a
vv. 26–27: *b-*, vv. 26a+b.27a

2.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 20–23 (I.1): *ywm*, vv. 20a.23b—inclusio
hw’, vv. 20a.22b+23a!—‘inclusio’
nṣpnw/wṣpw, vv. 20b and 22b resp. (alliter.)—linear
b-, vv. 21a+b.23b
vv. 24–27 (I.2): *ky*, vv. 25a.27a—exactly linear
’l (prep.), vv. 25a+b.26a!—concatenatio; see also *’l* (‘God’) in v. 25a—alliteration
gbr/ḥlb, vv. 25b and 27a resp.!; cf. 2 Sam. 1,22 (*ḥlb gbwrym*)
vv. 28–31 (II.1): *yšbw/tybš*, vv. 28b and 30b resp. (alliter.)—linear

2.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 20–27 (canto I): *ḥyl* hitpolel/*b‘t* pi‘el, vv. 20a and 24a resp.—linear
pḥd/ṣr wmṣwqh, vv. 21a and 24a resp.—linear
bw’/tqp, vv. 21b and 24b resp. (the misfortune ‘makes a raid’ on the wicked)—linear
ky, vv. 23b.27a—linear
ydw, vv. 23b.25a!

vv. 28–35 (canto II): *-m*, vv. 29b.35b—‘inclusio’
šlhbt/’š, vv. 30b and 34b resp.!—linear
ky, vv. 31b.34a—linear

2.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

The linear arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 17–19.20–21.28–29:	*w-* + root *spr*, vv. 17b.20b!
	’šr, vv. 18a.28c!
	wḷ’, vv. 18b+19b.29a+b!
	kḥd, vv. 18b.28a!
	-m, vv. 18b and 19a+b.29b*
	’rṣ, vv. 19a.29b!
	b-, vv. 19b.21a+b
vv. 22–23.30–31:	*l’*, vv. 22a.30a—exactly linear
	l’ y’myn šwb/’l y’mn bšw, vv. 22a and 31a resp.! (verbal repetition in combination with alliteration)—linear
	mny ḥšk, vv. 22a.30a!—linear; note the chiasm in connection with the preceding item (Fokkelman), and see also *ḥšk* in v. 23b!
	ḥrb/brwḥ, vv. 22b and 30c resp. (allit.)—linear
	ky, vv. 23b.31b—linear
vv. 24–27.32–35:	*k-*, vv. 24b.33a+b!—linear
	ky, vv. 27a.34a—linear

The symmetric arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 20–23.32–35:	*ywm*, vv. 20a+23b.32a!
	rš‘ . . . ‘ryṣ (cf. Job 27,13)/*ḥnp*, vv. 20 and 34a resp.!—inclusio; cf. Job 18,13.22 (!) 20,5
	kwn, vv. 23b.35b!
vv. 24–27.28–31:	*‘td*, vv. 24b.28c!
	nṭh, vv. 25a.29b!

2.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

2.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
b-, *-w*, *l’*, *mn* (v. 18)

2.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*-hw*), *l-*, (*swr*), (*šw’*)

2.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...|17–19.20–24|25–30.31–35 (...|3|[?]5.5[?].5)
Stickel (1842): ...|17–19|20–24.25–30|31–35 (...|3|5.6|5)
Schlottmann (1851): ...|17–19|20–24.25–30.31–35 (...||3||3.2|2.2.2|3.2); cf. Köster (1831) and Stickel (1842)
Ewald (1854): ...17–19|20–26.27–33.34–35 (...3|7.7.2)
Merx (1871): ...17–19.20–22.23–25|26–28.29–31.32–35 (...6.6.6|7.7.8)
Hitzig (1874): ...|17–19|20–24.25–28+30.31–35 (...|3|5.5.5)
Delitzsch (1876): ...17–19.20–24.25–30.31–35 (...6.10.14.10); cf. Schlottmann (1851)
Wright (1883): ...17–19|20–22.23–24.25–27.28–29.30–31.32–35 (...6|6.5.6.5.5.8)
Dillmann (1891): ...|17–19 (‘Einleitung’) 20–24.25–30.31–35 (...|3 10|9.5|10); cf. Delitzsch (1876)
Bickell (1894): ...18–19.20–21.22+23b+24a.25–26.30b–31.32–33.34–35
Ley (1895): ...|20–24.25–27+29–30.31–35 (...|3×5)
Duhm (1897): ...16–17.18–19|20–21.22–23.24+28c–29a.29b+30b–c.32–33.34–35
Vetter (1897): ...|17–19|20–35
Hontheim (1904): ...|20–27.28–35 (...|8.8)
Schlögl (1916): ...17–21.22–26.27–30.31–35 (...4×10)
Ball (1922): ...17–18.20–21.22–23.25–26.27–28.29–30.32–33.34–35
Peters (1928): ...|17–19.20–21.22–24.25–26.27–28.29–30.31–33.34–35 (...|3.2.3.2.2.2.3.2)
König (1929): ...17–24.25–35; similarly Van Selms (1982)
Kissane (1939): ...|17–21a.31+21b–24.25–29.30+32–35 (...|4×5)
Irwin (1946): ...17–19|20–21.22–23.24–25.26–27...34–35 (...3|?×2; no stanzas)
Möller (1955): ...12–19.20–28.29–35 (...20–27.28–35?; ...8.8.8!)
Skehan (1961): ...17–19.20–24.25–28+29b.29a+31b+30–34.35 (...3.5.5.5.1); cf. Mackenzie (1990)
Fohrer (1963): ...|17–19.20–22.23–25.26–28b.29+30b–c+32.33–35 (...|6×3)
Terrien (1963): ...; 17–19.20–21|22–24.25–26|27–28.29–30|31–33.34–35
Horst (1968): ...; 17–19|20–24.25–28.29–30+32–35 (...; 3|5.4.6)
TOB (1978): ...|17–30.31–35
KBS (1980): ...17–19.20–27.28–35
De Wilde (1981): ...|17–18.20–21.22–23a.23b–24.25–26.27–28b.28c–30a.30b–31.32–33.34–35
Webster (1983): ...; 17–19.20–23.24–26.27–30.31–35

Habel (1985): ...||17–19|20–24.25–27.28–31.32–34|35
Bezuidenhout (1986): ...||17–19.20–23|24–28.29–32.33–35
Clines (1989): ...|17–19.20–22.23–26.27–29.30–32.33–35 (...|3.3.4.3.3.3)

2.6 Comments and summary

Analysis 2.5 makes it clear that scholarly opinions greatly differ about the structure of this second part of Eliphaz's speech. And Clines rightly notes that the strophic structure of vv. 20–35 is not easy to discern (p. 356). Advocates of strophic structure generally attempt to find strophes which match the length of the strophes in 15,2–16. As the case may be, then, in 15,17–35 one finds predominantly strophes of five lines,[1] or strophes of three lines.[2]

In terms of content it is clear that vv. 17–19 represent an introductory strophe; see anal. 2.2.[3] The main body of the poem, the description of the fate of the wicked, begins with v. 20. Taking this for granted, the analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as a whole reveals that vv. 20–35 fall into two identical cantos of eight lines, vv. 20–27 and 28–35; see anal. 2.4.5. In vv. 17–19 we find a cluster of words which is repeated especially in vv. 28–29; but see also *w'sprh/wmspr* in vv. 17 and 20 respectively. Most of these words do not occur elsewhere in the poem! The first canto especially deals with the wicked man's fear of his ruin; the second canto with the actual destruction of the evildoer (see anal. 2.2).[4] Within the context of this bipartite framework vv. 30a and 31 obviously belong to the formal skeleton of the poem and do not represent a secondary insertion (cf. anal. 2.1). These cola contain deliberate repetitions from vv. 22–23, the corresponding strophe in the first canticle of canto I (note anal. 2.4.5). The images drawn from plant life really crop up from v. 32 onwards, while there is only a brief allusion to the plant imagery in v. 30b (according to MT not in v. 30c!). So v. 31 is not as 'inappropriate' (Gordis) here as has been suggested; note also *ky* in v. 31b (see anal. 2.4.5 and below).

---

[1] So Köster, Ley, Kissane, Skehan, Terrien, Mackenzie; see also Schlögl and cf. Schlottmann.

[2] So Fohrer and Clines; see also Merx and Wright.

[3] So also Stickel, Schlottmann, Dillmann, Vetter, Horst and Habel. Ley and Hontheim delete these verses from the context. For the special character of this strophe see part VI, 1.2.6.

[4] 'Der Böse lebt in beständiger Unruhe und fällt bald durch das Schwert' (vv. 20–27), 'Ja, das Glück des Ruchlosen hat keinen Bestand' (vv. 28–35); so Hontheim, pp. 155–56 (see also Möller, pp. 50–51). According to Clines vv. 20–26 recount the 'dreadful *present* state of the wicked' with emphasis on his inner suffering, and vv. 27–35 recount his 'dreadful *future* state' with emphasis on his outward destruction (p. 361). For the correct demarcation of the cantos, the break between vv. 27 and 28, see also below.

According to Habel Eliphaz's speech on the wicked man predominantly divides into four sections: 'Portrayal of a man afraid of Darkness' (vv. 20–24), 'Portrayal of a clumsy hero' (vv. 25–27), 'Portrayal of an empty future' (vv. 28–31), 'Portrayal of premature devastation' (vv. 32–34). In broad outlines Habel's design reflects the rhetorical structure of our poem very well. His thematic descriptions and demarcation of the second unit, however, depart too much from the idea that the train of thought in our poem is mainly linear. The overall reasoning actually shows a linear progression. And from this starting-point it seems most natural indeed that v. 24 should belong with the preceding lines.[5] This approach, however, does not take into account that repetition of formal and semantic elements generally forms the basis of the rhetorical structure in a Hebrew poem. The repetition of the preposition *k-* in the context of the poem as a whole suggests that v. 24 belongs with the following verses, vv. 25–27; see anal. 2.4.5. And from a thematic point of view it can be observed that v. 24 picks up an idea from the beginning of the preceding canticle (vv. 20–21; see also anal. 2.4.4). This idea—the dread of the evildoer—then, functions as point of departure for the main thought of vv. 24–27, the rebellious attitude of the evildoer towards God. Vv. 24–27 formulate the root of the wicked man's agonies. The evildoer's 'fatness' (v. 27) is not a sign of his 'strength and sound health' (Fohrer, Clines), but rather a 'metaphor for religious insensitivity'.[6] At the same time, this fatness seems to belong with the military imagery of the vv. 24–26; note *ḥlb gbwrym* ('the fatness of the heroes') in the poem of 2 Sam. 1,22.[7] V. 35, finally, does not represent a 'summative didactic statement' (Habel; cf. Skehan), but most naturally belongs with v. 34; see anal. 2.2. So, the identical cantos again divide into two four-line canticles. Within this overall structure the particle *ky* seems to play an important framing part; note *ky* in the last line of I.1, I.2 and II.1, and in the second last line of II.2. Especially from a semantic point of view these canticles form a *linear*, external parallelism; see anal. 2.2. Canticles I.1 and II.1, each, explicitly deal with the evildoer's (fear of his) *destruction*; canticles I.2 and II.2 use metaphorical language and describe the *cause* of his fear/destruction.[8]

---

[5] For vv. 20–24 as a close unity see also Köster, Stickel, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Ley, Skehan and Horst.

[6] So Gordis, with reference to Deut. 32,15 Isa. 6,10 Jer. 5,28 Pss. 73,7–10 119,70; cf. also Horst.

[7] Consequently, the 'military figures' in vv. 24 and 26 do not form 'a ring around the central concept in v. 25' (against Webster, p. 45). The central concept of vv. 24–27 is represented by the correlation of ideas in vv. 24–27. And the 'military figures' are typical of ***each of the lines*** of this canticle.

Given the skeleton of the poem on the level of the cantos and the canticles, its strophic structure (strophes of two lines) is predominantly suggested by the analysis of the material content; see anal. 2.2.

The *quintessential thought* of the poem is to be found at the beginning and the end of vv. 20–35. According to Clines v. 20 represents the nodal verse of ch. 15. The inclusio that determines the scope of the main body of 15,17–35, note *rš‘*, *‘ryṣ* and *ḥnp* in vv. 20 and 34 (anal. 2.4.5), indicate that we have to take v. 20 in relation with the final lines: *the wicked man writhes in pain all his days and is overtaken by his own evil deeds.*

Together with the first poem of Eliphaz's second speech vv. 17–35 form a formal unit. This is especially indicated by inclusio. Habel correctly notes that the imagery of conceiving and begetting (vv. 34–35) enables the poet 'to bring his speech back full circle to the opening verse' (pp. 250–51); note *bṭn* ('belly') in vv. 2b and 35b.[9] On the basis of this formal device, however, we may not conclude that ch. 15 represents only *one* poem. The macrostructure of vv. 17–35 totally differs from the macrostructure of vv. 2–16. In the first place, vv. 17–19 form a special introductory strophe to vv. 20–35. Next, each poem has its own canto length: five and eight lines respectively. These cantos also display their own, special strophic structure: 2.3 and 2.2|2.2 respectively. The verbal repetitions that primarily determine the beginning of the cantos are unique for the successive poems, too.

---

[8] V. 28 is frequently connected with the preceding verse (see anal. 2.5). In the context of the canticle structure of our poem, however, this relationship has to be ruled out. The line does not continue the preceding theme because v. 28 refers to the *punishment* of the wicked (cf. vv. 20–23) and not to his *crimes* (with Gordis and Clines; as against Horst). The ungodly man 'is cast out from the society of other people when they recognize him as accursed by God' (Clines).

[9] See in this connection also *ml'* in 15,2b and 32a. Cf. further *ḥkm* in 15,18 and 15,2.8, *'b* in 15,18 and 15,10, *rš‘* in 15,20 and 15,6, *ḥyl* in 15,20 and 15,7, *l'/'l y‘myn* in 15,22.31 and 15,15, *ky ... 'l 'l* in 15,25 and 15,13, *rwḥ* in 15,30 and 15,2.13, *ph* in 15,30 and 15,5.6.13, *yld* in 15,35 and 15,7.14.

3 Job’s second reply to Eliphaz: Job 16–17

Structure: 6 16.16 > 6 8.4.4|5.5.6 > 3.3 2.3.3|2.2|2.2||2.3|2.3|2.2.2

A	2	*šm‘ty k’lh rbwt*	*mnḥmy ‘ml KLkm*	
	3	*hqṣ ldbry RWḤ*	*’w* **mh** *ymryṣk ky T‘NH*	
	4	*gm ’nky kkm* **’dbrh**	*lw yš npškm tḥt npšy*	
	4	*’ḥbyrh ‘lykm bmlym*	*w’ny‘h ‘lykm bmw r’šy*	
	5	*’’mṣkm bmw py*	*wnyd śpty yḥśk*	
	6	*’m* **’dbrh** *l’ yḥśk k’by*	*w’ḥdlh* **mh** *mny YHLK*	

I.1	7	**’k ‘th** *hl’ny*	*hšmwt KL ‘dty*	
	8	*wtqmṭny* **l‘d** *hyh*	*wyqm by kḥšy*	**bpny** *Y‘NH*
	9	*’pw ṭrp wyśṭmny*	*ḥrq ‘ly bšnyw*	*ṣry ylṭwš ‘ynyw ly*
	10	*p‘rw ‘ly bpyhm*	*bḥrph hkw lḥyy*	*yḥd ‘ly ytml’wn*
	11	*ysgyrny ’l ’l ‘wl*	*w‘l ydy rš‘ym yrṭny*	
	12	*šlw* **hyyty** *wyprprny*	*w’ḥz b‘rpy wypṣpṣny*	**wyqymny** *lw lmṭrh*
	13	*ysbw ‘ly rbyw*	*yplḥ klywty wl’ yḥmwl*	*yšpk* **l’rṣ** *mrrty*
	14	*yprṣny prṣ ‘l* PNY *prṣ*	*yrṣ ‘ly* **kgbwr**	
I.2	15	*śq tprty ‘ly gldy*	*w‘llty b‘pr qrny*	
	16	**pny** *ḥmrmrh mny bky*	*w‘l ‘p‘py ṣlmwt*	
	17	*‘l l’ ḥms bkpy*	*wtplty zkh*	
	18	**’rṣ** *’l tksy dmy*	*w’l* **yhy mqwm** *lz‘qty*	
I.3	19	**gm ‘th** *hnh bšmym* **‘dy**	*wśhdy bMRWMYM*	
	20	*mlyṣy R‘Y*	*’l ’lwh dlph ‘YNY*	
	21	*wywkḥ* **lgbr** *‘m ’lwh*	*wBN ’dm lR‘hw*	
	22	*ky šnwt mspr y’tyw*	*w’rḥ l’ ’šwb ’HLK*	

II.1	1	*RWḤy ḥblh* **ymy** *nz‘kw*	*qbrym ly*
	2	*’m l’ htlym ‘mdy*	*wbhmrwtm tln ‘YNY*
	3	*śymh* **n’** *‘rbny ‘mk*	**my** *hw’* **lydy** *ytq‘*
	4	*ky lbm ṣpnt mśkl*	*‘l kn l’ TRMM*
	5	*lḥlq ygyd R‘YM*	*w‘YNY BNYw tklnh*

II.2	6	*whṣgny lmšl ‘mym*	*wtpt* **lpnym** *’hyh*
	7	*wtkh mk‘s* **‘yny**	*wyṣry kṣl* KLM
	8	*yšmw yšrym ‘l z’t*	*wnqy ‘l ḥnp yt‘rr*
	9	*wy’ḥz ṣdyq drkw*	*wṭhr* **ydym** *ysyp ’mṣ*
	10	*w’wlm* KLM *tšbw wb’w* **n’**	*wl’ ’mṣ’ bkm ḥkm*
II.3	11	**ymy** *‘brw zmty ntqw*	*mwršy lbby*
	12	*lylh* **lywm** *yśymw*	*’wr qrwb* **mpny** *ḥšk*
	13	*’m* ’QWH *š’wl byty*	*bḥšk rpdty yṣw‘y*
	14	*lšḥt qr’ty ’by ’th*	*’my w’ḥty lrmh*
	15	*w’yh ’pw* TQWTY	*w*TQWTY **my** *yšwrnh*
	16	**bdy** *š’l trdnh*	*’m yḥd ‘l ‘pr nḥt*

3.1 Text

16,4c—*’ḥbyrh*: hiph‘il of *ḥbr* (‘unite, join’); so Gordis, Habel, Hartley. HAL: ‘Worte **künsteln** gegen’. Clines follows Finkelstein’s proposal (*JBL* 75 [1956], pp. 328–31) of a verb *ḥbr* ‘make sound’ (see also O. Loretz, *CBQ* 23 [1961], pp. 293–94).

16,11a—*‘wl*: ‘evildoer, unrighteous person’ (so Hartley, Clines; cf. NBG and Habel). The parallelism with *rš‘* (v. 11b) corroborates this reading; cf. 27,7 and 31,3. MT *‘wyl* (‘small child, boy’).

16,12–13: according to the masoretic accentuation we are dealing with two tricola; this interpretation is followed here (cf. NBG and Gordis). The successive cola of vv. 12–13 are generally taken as three bicola (see Dhorme, De Wilde, Habel and Clines, among others).

16,20a—*mlyṣy r‘y*: the meaning of *r‘* in 16,20–21 is probably constant (cf. Andersen); this points to ‘scorners’ for *mlyṣy* (so Budde, Driver-Gray, NBG, Kroeze, Weiser), although this translation is not without problems (see the commentaries). MT reads both nouns as plurals; Habel, Hartley and Clines take them as singulars (‘my interpreter is my friend’, Hartley)—cf. also C. Gross, *BT* 43 (1992), 236–41.

17,3a—*‘rbny*: the consonants allow to read ‘my pledge’ (so most critics); the vocalization of MT suggests ‘take me on pledge’.

17,4—*trmm*: a contracted form of *trmmm* (‘You will exalt them’); so GKC § 72cc, Horst, NJPS (cf. also Habel).

17,5a: the exact meaning of the colon is obscure. The line in question is probably a popular proverb about the stupid behaviour of those ‘who seek to put on a pretense of wealth while they are actually poor’ (Gordis; so also Weiser, Horst, Clines—cf. Habel).

17,10a—*klm*: the suffix of the third person plural is used as a vocative; cf. 1 Kings 22,28 Mic. 1,2 and Mal. 3,9—GKC § 135r. See also analysis 3.4.3.

17,11: following LXX scholars frequently place the caesura after *zmty*, thus restoring a 3:3 rhythm (Hölscher, Horst, Gordis, NEB, a.o.); see also A.C.M. Blommerde, *Biblica* 55 (1974), 549–52. From a rhythmical point of view, however, this first line of canticle II.3 matches the first line of canticle II.1 (17,1; Andersen). So the masoretic accentuation may reflect a genuine, formal device.

17,12b—*qrwb mpny*: 'near from the face of'; the idiom is unparalleled (Clines), but is connected with the expression *lpnym* in 17,6b; cf. anal. 3.4.4.

17,15b—*wtqwty*: Duhm and Pope emend to *wṭwbty* ('my good things'), following LXX.

17,16a—*bdy*: a contracted form of *bydy* ('in the hands of'); so M. Dahood, 'Northwest Semitic Philology and Job', in J.L. MacKenzie, *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*, New York, 1962, pp. 62–63 (Pope and Blommerde, cf. BHS). This reading is supported by anal. 3.4.4. With reference to LXX most critics emend to *h‘mdy* (*h*- interr. + 'with me'); so Duhm, Fohrer, Clines (a.o.). 'Chambers' (Gordis, Hartley; cf. NBG).

17,16b—*nḥt*: 'rest'; so MT. Revocalization to 'we shall descend' is generally recommended; see also analysis 3.4.5.

3.2 Content

Notwithstanding his distress Job puts his trust in God on the basis of his innocence.

A Introduction: Job reproaches his friends for being poor comforters.
  If you were in my place you would understand that these long-winded speeches of yours overshoot the mark (vv. 2–4b).
  Words do not relieve my miserable fate (vv. 4c–6).
I Job's trust in God: notwithstanding his troubles he sticks to his innocence.
  I.1 Description of the distress.
    My misery is a *seeming witness* against me (vv. 7–8).
    God himself pours out disasters over me (image of a savage beast; vv. 9–11).
    God himself pours out disasters over me (image of a warrior; vv. 12–14).
  I.2 Declaration of innocence.
    Seemingly I am a repentant sinner (vv. 15–16).
    My misery should not be forgotten, for I am innocent (vv. 17–18).

- I.3 Job continues to place his hope in God.
    - Therefore, I address myself to my *witness* in heaven (vv. 19–20).
    - He will justify me before I go the way of no return (vv. 21–22).
- II Appeal to God with reference to the hope for the righteous and in view of his imminent stay in the underworld.
    - II.1 Appeal to God.
        - I have to suffer deadly provocations from my enemies (vv. 1–2).
        - Appeal to God, as Job's only refuge, to silence the mockers (vv. 3–5).
    - II.2 The hope for the righteous.
        - I am racked with sorrow because I have become a laughing stock among people (vv. 6–7; cf. 17,1–2).
        - The righteous can have confidence before the impious man with his lack of wisdom (vv. 8–10; cf. 17,3–5).
    - II.3 The definite end is at hand.
        - My life is coming to an end regardless of man's consoling words (vv. 11–12; cf. 17,6–7).
        - The only perspective for the future is Sheol (vv. 13–14); therefore, I have no hope left at all (vv. 15–16; cf. 17,3–5).

3.3 Transition markers

3.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

3.3.1.1 *’lh*, 16,2a
cohortative: *’ḥbyrh*, 16,4c
cohortative: *’ny‘h*, 16,4d
’k, 16,7a
‘th, 16,7a
‘th, 16,19a
hnh, 16,19a
w- beginning line, 16,21a
imper. energ.: *śymh*, 17,3a
n’, 17,3a
my, 17,3b
hw’, 17,3b
w- beginn. line, 17,6a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in 17,7a
z’t, 17,8a
ḥnp, 17,8b
w- beginning line, 17,15a
’yh, 17,15a
’pw, 17,15a
my, 17,15b

3.3.1.2 *gm*, 16,19a

3.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

3.3.2.1 *gm*, 16,4a
’nky, 16,4a
’l (prohib.), 16,18a
’l (prohib.), 16,18b

3.3.2.2 cohortative: *’dbrh*, 16,4a
lw, 16,4b
cohortative: *’dbrh*, 16,6a
cohortative: *’ḥdlh*, 16,6b
mh, 16,6b
rš‘, 16,11b
vocative: *’rṣ*, 16,18a
w- beginn. line, 17,10a;
ext. // *w*- beginn. line in 17,9a
’wlm, 17,10a
vocative: *klm*, 17,10a
jussive : *tšbw*, 17,10a
imperative: *b’w*, 17,10a
n’, 17,10a

3.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

mh, 16,3b
h- interr., 16,3a
w- beginning line, 16,8a
’th, 17,14a
tqwh, 17,15a+b (but note the final strophe)

3.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

3.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’ḥz*, 16,12, 17,9; *’l* (prep.), 16,11, 20; *’l* (proh.), 16,18, 18; *’lwh*, 16,20, 21—cf. *’l* (‘God’) in 16,11; *’m*, 16,6, 17,2, 13, 16; *’mṣ*, 16,5, 17,9; *’rṣ*, 16,13, 18; *’th* (‘to come’)/ *’th* (‘you’), 16,22, 17,14
b: *b*-, 16,4, 4, 5, 8, 8, 9, 10, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 19, 17,2, 10, 13, 16*; *bn*, 16,21, 17,5
g: *gbr*, 16,14, 21; *gm*, 16,4, 19
d: *dbr*, 16,3, 4, 6
h: *hyh*, 16,8, 12, 18, 17,6; *hlk*, 16,6, 22
w: -*w*, 16,9 (3×), 12, 13, 17,5, 9
ḥ: *ḥśk*, 16,5, 6; *ḥšk*, 17,12, 13
y: -*y*, 16,4, 4, 5, 5, 6, 7, 8 (3×), 9 (3×), 10 (3×), 12, 13 (3×), 14, 15, 15, 16, 17, 17, 18, 18, 19, 19, 20, 20, 17,1, 1, 2, 2, 7, 7, 11 (3×), 13, 13, 14 (3×), 15, 15; *yd*, 16,11, 17,3, 9, 16*; *ywm*, 17,1, 11, 12; *yḥd*, 16,10, 17,16
k: *k*-, 16,2, 4, 14, 17,7; -*k*, 16,3, 17,3; *ky*, 16,3, 22, 17,4; *kl*, 16,2, 7, 17,7, 10; *km*, 16,2, 4 (4×), 5, 17,10
l: *l*-, 16,3, 8, 9, 12, 12, 13, 18, 21, 21, 17,1, 3, 5, 6, 6, 12, 14, 14; *l’*, 16,6, 13, 17, 22, 17,2, 4, 10; *lbb*, 17,4, 11
m: -*m*, 17,2, 4, 7, 10; *mh*, 16,3, 6; -*mw*, 16,4, 5; *my*, 17,3, 15; *mn*, 17,4, 7, 12; *mny*, 16,6, 16; *mrr*, 16,13, 17,2
n: *n’*, 17,3, 10; -*ny*, 16,7, 8, 9, 11, 12 (3×), 14, 17,3, 6; *npš*, 16,4, 4
‘: *‘d*, 16,8, 19; *‘yn*, 16,9, 20, 17,2, 5, 7; *‘l*, 16,4, 4, 9, 10, 10, 11, 13, 14, 14, 15 (*‘ly*), 16, 17, 17,4, 8, 8, 16; *‘m* (prep.), 16,21, 17,2 (*‘md*), 3—cf. *‘m*

(‘people’) in 17,6; *‘nh*, 16,3, 8; *‘pr*, 16,15, 17,16; *‘th*, 16,7, 19
p: *ph*, 16,5, 10; *pnh*, 16,8, 14, 16, 17,6, 12; *prṣ*, 16,14 (3×)
ṣ: *ṣlmwt/ṣl*, 16,16 and 17,7 respectively
q: *qwh*, 17,13, 15, 15; *qwm*, 16,8, 12, 18
r: *rbb*, 16,2, 13, 13; *rwḥ*, 16,3, 17,1; *rwm*, 16,19, 17,4; *r‘*, 16,20, 21, 17,5
ś: *śym*, 17,3, 12
š: *š’wl*, 17,13, 16; *šwb*, 16,22, 17,10; *šmm*, 16,7, 17,8

3.4.2 Within the strophes

16,2–4b: *k-*, vv. 2a.4a—inclusion
dbr, vv. 3a.4a
16,4c–6: *bmw*, vv. 4d.5a!
yḥśk, 5b.6a!
16,7–8: *kl ‘dty/l‘d*, vv. 7b and 8a resp.—alliteration
16,9–11: *‘ly*, vv. 9b.10a+c
16,12–14: *-w*, vv. 12c.13a
‘ly, vv. 13a.14b
16,15–16: *w‘llty b‘pr/w‘l ‘p‘py*, vv. 15b and 16b resp.—allit. (linear)
16,17–18: *wtplty zkh/lz‘qty*, vv. 17b and 18b resp.—alliteration
17,8–10: *yšr/ṣdq*, vv. 8a and 9a resp.—linear
nqh/ṭhr, vv. 8b and 9b resp.—linear
’mṣ’/’mṣ, vv. 9b and 10b resp.—alliteration
17,11–12: *ywm*, vv. 11a.12a
17,13–14: *š’wl/šḥt*, vv. 13a and 14a resp.

3.4.3 Within the canticles

16,7–14 (I.1): *hyh*, vv. 8a.12a—‘inclusio’
qwm, vv. 8b.12c—‘inclusio’
pnh, vv. 8c.14a—linear
-w, vv. 9a+b+c.12c+13a
’l/gbwr, vv. 11a and 14b resp.—linear; see Deut. 10,17 Isa. 10,21 Jer. 32,18 (cf. Ps. 24,8; Habel)
16,19–22 (I.3): *r‘*, vv. 20a.21b—concatenatio
’lwh, vv. 20b.21a!—concatenatio
17,1–5 (II.1): *‘yn*, vv. 2b.5b—linear
17,6–10 (II.2): *klm*, vv. 7b.10a!—linear
17,11–16 (II.3): *ḥšk*, vv. 12b.13b!—concatenatio
qwh, vv. 13a.15a+b!—linear
š’wl, vv. vv. 13a.16a!

3.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

16,2–6 (A): *-km*, vv. 2b+4a+b.4c+d+5a—‘concatenatio’
mh, vv. 3b.6b!
’dbrh, vv. 4a.6a—linear; see also *dbr* in v. 3a!

16,7–22 (canto I): *’k ‘th/gm ‘th*, vv. 7a and 19a resp.!—exactly linear
‘d, vv. 8a.19a!—linear
pny, vv. 8c.16a—linear; see also *pnym* in v. 14a
’l ’l/’l ’lwh, vv. 11a and 20b resp.!; see also *’lwh* in v. 21a!
hyh, vv. 12a.18b—linear; see also v. 8a
qwm, vv. 12c.18b—linear; see also v. 8b!
l’, vv. 13b.17a.22b—linear
’rṣ, vv. 13c.18a!—linear
gbr, vv. 14b.21a!—linear

17,1–16 (canto II): *ywm*, vv. 1b.11a+12a!—linear
qbrym/qrwb, vv. 1c and 12b resp. (alliter.)—linear
‘yny, vv. 2b.7a—linear; see also *‘ynym* in v. 5b
śym, vv. 3a.12a!
n’, vv. 3a.10a!—linear
my, vv. 3b.15b!—linear; see also *’yh* in v. 15a!
yd, vv. 3b.9b.16a*—linear
lbb, vv. 4a.11b!
mn, vv. 4a.7a.12b!
śkl/ḥkm, vv. 4a and 10b resp.!—linear
‘l, vv. 4b.8a+b.16b—linear
-w, vv. 5b.9a—linear
pnym, vv. 6b.12b—linear (cf. canto I)
yšrym/yšwrnh, vv. 8a and 15b resp. (allit.)—linear

3.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

The linear arrangement of the cantos.

16,2–4b.7–8.17,1–2: *kl*, 16,2b.7b—linear
rwḥ, 16,3a.17,1a!
‘nh, 16,3b.8c!

16,4c–6.21–22.17,13–16: *ḥśk/ḥšk*, 16,5b+6a and 17,13b resp.—alliter.; see also *ḥšk* in 17,12b!

’m, 16,6a and 17,13a+16b
l’, 16,6a.22b
hlk, 16,6b.22b!—exactly linear; see also _nḥt*_ in 17,16b (final verb of canto II!; cf. Isa. 30,29–30)
’th/’th, 16,22a.17,14a

The symmetric arrangement of the cantos.

16,7–18.17,6–16: *‘dh/’b ... ’m ... ’ḥwt*, 16,7b and 17,14 resp.; see also *byt* in 17,13
šmm, 16,7b.17,8a!
hyh, 16,8a+12a+18b.17,6b!
pnym, 16,8c+14a+16a.17,6b+12b!
yḥd ‘l, 16,10c.17,16b!
’ḥz, 16,12b.17,9a!
‘pr, 16,15b.17,16b!
ṣlmwt/ṣl, 16,16b and 17,7b resp.!
zkk/yšr, 16,17b and 17,8a resp.; cf. Job 8,6 Prov. 20,11 21,8 and see also *nqy* in 17,8b
zkk/ṣdq, 16,17b and 17,9a respectively; cf. Job 8,3+6 15,14–15 25,4–5 33,9+12 and see also *ṭhr* in 17,9b

16,19–22.17,1–5: *rwm*, 16,19b.17,4b!
bmrwmym/wbhmrwtm, 16,19b and 17,2b resp.—(alliter.)
r‘, 16,20a+21b.17,5a!
‘yn, 16,20b.17,2b+5b
‘m, 16,21a.17,3a!; see also *‘md* in 17,2a!
bn, 16,21b.17,5b!
ky, 16,22a.17,4a
w’rḥ/rwḥy, 16,22b and 17,1a resp.—alliter.

3.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

3.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

’m (17,2), *-y*, *yd* (16,11), *k-*, *ky* (16,3b), *-km* (17,10), *l’*, *-m*, *‘l*, *‘yn* (16,9)

3.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

’mṣ, (*’l* [proh.]), *b-*, *gm*, *-k*, *l-*, *mny*, *mrr*, (*npš*), *-ny*, *ph*, (*prṣ*), *rbb*, *šwb*

3.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 16,2–5.6–8.9–11.12–14.15–17.18–22|17,1–4.5–7.8–9.10–12.13–16 (4.4×3.5|4.3.2.3.4); similarly Stickel (1842)

Schlottmann (1851): 16,2–3.4–5|6–8.9–11|12–14.15–17||18–19.20–21.22–17,2|3–5.6–7.8–9|10–12.13–14.15–16 (2.2|3.3|3.3||2.2.3|3.2.2|3.2.2)

Ewald (1854): 16,2–5|6–8.9–11.12–14.15–17|18–17,2|3–9|10–16 (4|4×3|7|7|7; note p. 344)

Merx (1871): 16,2–3.4.5–6.7–8.9–10a.10b–11.12–13|14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–17,1*.3–4.5–7|8–10.11–12.13–14.15–16 (6×4.6|6×4.6|6.3×4)

Hitzig (1874): 16,2–5 6–9.10–11.12–14.15–17|18–22.17,1–5|6–9.10–12.13–16 (4 4.2.3.3|5.5|4.3.4)

Delitzsch (1876): 16,2–5.6–9.10–11.12–14.15–17.18–22|17,1–2.3–5.6–9.10–12.13–16 (10.10.5.8.6.10|5.6.8.7.8)

Wright (1883): 16,2–3.4–5.6–8|9–11.12–14|15–16.17–19.20–21.22–17,1|2–4.5–7.8–9|10–12.13–14.15–16 (4.6.6|8.8|4.6.4.4|6.6.4|6.4.4)

Dillmann (1891): 16,2–3.4–5|6–8.9–11.12–14.15–17|18–21.22–17,2.3–5.6–9|10–12.13–16 (4.6|8.8.8.6|8.6.6.8|6.8); cf. Schlottmann (1851)

Bickell (1894): 16,2–3.4a–b+5.7+9a–b.9c–10.11–12b.12c–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22+17,1a+c+2a.3+5.6–7.8–9.10–11.13–14.15–16

Ley (1895): 16,2–5.6–11.12–17.18–22.17,1–5.6–10.11–16 (5.7.7.5.3×5)

Duhm (1897): 16,2–3.4.5–6|7–8.9a–b+12a–b.12c–13.14+17.15–16|18–19.20–21|22–17,1.2–3.6–7.11–12.13–14.15–16

Vetter (1897): 16,2–5.6–17.18–17,1.2–9.10–16

Hontheim (1904): 16,2–6|7–11||12–14||15–17+17,8–10.16,18–21+17,3–4|16,22+17,1–7*.11–16 (6.6|4|12.12)

Schlögl (1916): 16,2–4.5–8.9–11.12–14.15–18.19–22.17,1–4.5–8.9–12.13–16 (10×8)

Ball (1922): 16,2+4a–b.4c–5.7–8.9a–b+11.12–13a.13b–14.16–17.18–19.20–21.17,1–2.3–4.5+7.11–12.13–14.15–16

Peters (1928): 16,2–3.4–5.6–8.9–10.11–12b.12c–14.15–16|17–18.19–21.22–17,1|2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–12.13–14.15–16 (2.2.3.3.2.3.2|2.3.2|4×2.3.2.2)

König (1929): 16,2–5.6–17.18–17,9.10–16

Kissane (1939): 16,2–6.7–11+17.12–16|18–21+17,9+16,22+17,1.2–7.10–16 (6.7.6|7.6.7; ‘two parts’)

Möller (1955): 16,2–5.6–11.12–17.18–17,4.5–10.11–16 (4.6.6.9.6.6)

Skehan (1961): 16,2–4b.4c–6.7–9b.9c–12b.12c–14.15–17.18–21.22–17,2.3–6*.7–9.10–12.13–16 (3×3.4.3.3.4.5×3.4)

Fohrer (1963): 16,2–4b.4c–6|7–9b.12–14.15–17.18–22|17,1–4.5–7.11–13.14–16 (3.3|3.4.3.5|4.3×3)

Terrien (1963): 16,2–3.4–6|7–8.9–11|12–14.15–17|18–19.20–22; 17,1–2.3–5|6–7.8–10|11–12.13–16
Horst (1968): 16,2–6 7–8.9+12–14.15–17|18–22|17,1–5+10.11–16 (6 2.5.3|5|3.3.6)
Epping-Nelis (1968): 16,2–6.7–11.12–17.18–22.17,1–10(=1–5.6–10).11–16
TOB (1978): 16,2–5|6–17|18–22.17,1–5|6–10.11–16
KBS (1980): 16,2–6.7–10.11–14.15–18.19–21.22.17,1–2.3–5.6–9.10–12.13–16
De Wilde (1981): 16,2–3.4.5–6.7–8.9a–b+12a–b.12c–13.14+17.15–16|18–19.20–21.22–17,1|2–3.4–5.6–7.11–12.13–14.15–16
Van Selms (1982): 16,2–6.7–14.15–22.17,1–10.11–16 (but cf. also p. 156)
Webster (1983): 16,2–5.6–9.10–14.15–17; 18–21.22–17,2.3–7.8–12.13–16
Habel (1985): 16,1–5 6–17.18–17,1.2–10.11–16 (a b.c.b'.c')
Bezuidenhout (1986): 16,2–3.4–6|7–8.9–11.12–14|15–18.19–22||17,1–2.3–4.5–7|8–10.11–12||13–14.15–16 (2.4|2.3.3|4.4||2.2.3|3.2|3.2||2.2)
Hartley (1988): 16,2–6.7–17.18–22.17,1–16
Clines (1989): 16,2–6|7–11.12–14.15–17|18–22||17,1–5|6–10|11–16 (6|5.4.3|5||5|5|6 > a.b.c|c'.a'.b'; 'The *structure* ... is not so clear as in other speeches'; see also p. 377)
MacKenzie (1990): 2–4b.4c–6.7–9b.9c–11+17.12–13.14–16|18–21|22–17,2.3–5.6–8.10–12.13–16 (3×3.4.3.3|4|4×3.4)

3.6 Comments and summary

Unlike Job's speeches in the first cycle, his speeches in cycle II encompass only one poem each. And although the chapter division seems to point in a different direction (cf. chs. 4–5, 6–7, 9–10, 12–14), on the basis of the analysis of the verbal repetitions and the arrangement of the ideas in chs. 16 and 17 I conclude that we are dealing with only one, large-scale poem.[1] As will be demonstrated below the verbal repetitions form a consistent pattern and support the commonly held view about the thematic unity of the two chapters.[2] Nevertheless, the chapter division is aptly placed: it demarcates the dividing line between the two cantos of the main body of the poem (16,7–22 and 17,1–16).

The poem opens with an introductory unit (16,2–6), in which Job obviously addresses his friends and reproaches them for being poor comforters

---

[1] Cf. ch. 15, the preceding speech of Eliphaz: two poems!

[2] But see Terrien and Webster, who assume that we are dealing with two poems; see anal. 3.5.

(cf. 15,17–19).[3] Especially earlier scholars are of the opinion that this introductory unit should end with v. 5.[4] This is suggested, according to Habel, by the similarity of themes in 16,6–17 and Ps. 39 (note Ps. 39,3). However, the verb form *ʾdbrh* in vv. 4a and 6a especially (see anal. 3.4.4) and the opening words of v. 7, *ʾk ʿth* (see anal. 3.3.1.1) suggest that the introductory unit ends with v. 6. For the break between vv. 6 and 7 see also below, about the function of the root *hlk* at the end of v. 6b. Furthermore, the directions of address in our chapters, again (cf. ch. 12–14 etc.), do not afford a very helpful criterion for demarcating the successive units from 16,7 onwards. In 16,7b–8a and 17,3–4 Job addresses God; in 16,9–14 and 19–21 he speaks about God in the third person, whereas there are no clear signs that he speaks to his friends. In 16,18 Job addresses the earth, and in 17,10 he again addresses his friends (cf. 16,2–6).[5] Commentators of chapters 16–17 are confronted with an almost inextricable fusion of motifs and themes. According to Clines we are dealing here with ‘the most disjointed of all the speeches in the book up to this point’ (p. 377).[6] Nevertheless, I will attempt to show that the poem displays a well-thought-out pattern of ideas, which is supported by an obvious pattern of verbal repetitions. However, as far as the rhetorical structure in its entirety is concerned, the poem displays a rather unique rhetorical structure indeed.

The decisive factor in defining the rhetorical structure of our poem is again the pattern of verbal repetitions we find on the level of the poem as a whole. This pattern confirms the suggestion of the chapter division: the main body of the poem falls into two identical cantos of 16 lines and the caesura between these cantos coincides with the chapter division; cf. Köster, Delitzsch, Fohrer and Terrien. Just like the introductory unit of 15,17–35 (vv. 17–19), the introductory unit 16,2–6 contains a cluster of words which are repeated at crucial positions in the main body of the poem. In the first two lines of the introduction we find three words which are repeated at the beginning of cantos I and II, 16,7–8 and 17,1 resp.; see *kl*, *rwḥ* (‘spirit’) and *ʿnh* (‘to answer’) in anal. 3.4.5. The noun *rwḥ* and the verb *ʿnh* do not occur elsewhere in the poem. The refrain-like repetition of the root *hlk* (‘to walk’) at the end of the introductory unit and the first canto, 16,6b and 22b resp., is enhanced by the verb *nḥt** (‘to descend’) at the end of the second canto, 17,16b. Therefore, the delimitation of the cantos is in the first place founded on a linear pattern of verbal repetitions. The cantos are connected with each other by the device of 'thematic extension'. The final line of canto I refers to the underworld ('the way of no return', 16,22b). The theme of Job's stay in the underworld is the starting point for the train of thought in the second canto; note *qbrym* in 17,1b (cf. Horst). The bipartite structure of the main body of the poem, however, is also indicated by a symmetrical arrangement of ideas, which comes to light when we consider the poem on the level of the canticles.

---

[3] So also Fohrer, Horst, Van Selms, a.o.; cf. Habel (vv. 2–5: ‘exordium’). See part VI, 1.2.6 about the special character of such introductory units.

[4] So Ewald, Dillmann, Vetter, König, TOB, Habel.

[5] In this context Van Selms correctly notes that the poet is not willing to tie himself down to a scheme (p. 141); against Clines, p. 375.

[6] See also Andersen: ‘The themes we have identified are interwoven’ (p. 180); and ‘It is hard to find a path through the profusion of ideas in this speech’ (p. 184). Cf. Weiser with regard to the exegesis of ch. 17 (p. 130).

Each of the cantos divides into three canticles: 16,7–14, 15–18 and 19–22 (canto I), and 17,1–5, 6–10, 11–16 (canto II). The delimitation of the canticles is based on the mutual relationship of formal and thematic considerations. Seen from a thematic point of view there is a symmetric arrangement of ideas in the poem as a whole. Partly due to the fact that the successive themes which determine the canticles are frequently embedded in motifs of lament, especially in the second main part of the poem, critics have generally overlooked this thematic symmetry up till now. The first canticle of canto I (16,7–14) extensively deals with Job's distress, the attacks by God and man.[7] Job's elaborate lament about his impending sojourn in the underworld in the final canticle of canto II (17,11–16) most explicitly reminds us of this description of distress in canticle I.1. The main thought of the second canticle of canto I (16,15–18) we find in v. 17, where Job proclaims his *innocence*. This idea matches the main theme of the second canticle of canto II (17,6–10), in which we meet again the idea of the confidence of the *righteous* (note vv. 8–9; see also anal. 3.4.5). It is a moot question whether Job is speaking here of himself or, in an ironical sense, of his friends (see the commentaries). And on the basis of this analysis it cannot be decided which interpretation is the most probable. The analysis, however, shows that the lines concerned form an indispensable element within the overall structure of the poem. Critics frequently maintain that in 17,8–10 we meet a secondary expansion.[8] In this context they stress that 17,11 perfectly ties in with v. 7. And Hontheim transposes 17,8–10 to follow 16,15–17!; see anal. 3.5. These views, however, do not take into account that the repetition of ideas is not restricted to the level of the line or the strophe, but also figures on the higher structural levels of the canticles and the cantos. That is to say that parallel thoughts operate, even when they occur far and wide between. This phenomenon is a fundamental characteristic of Hebrew poetry and a means to constitiute its rhetorical skeleton. In the third canticle of canto I (16,19–22), finally, Job proclaims his confidence that God Himself will vindicate him in the presence of his ‘friends’ before he dies. This proclamation corresponds to the pivotal idea of the first canticle of canto II (17,1–5): Job’s confident appeal to God ‘to give him a favourable verdict in his dispute with the friends’ (Andersen; 17,3).[9] Cf. also the device of ‘thematic extension’ between cantos I and II, described above.

---

[7] Cf. T.N.D. Mettinger, 'Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages', in H.A. McKay and D.J.A. Clines, *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom Sages* (JSOTS 162), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993, pp. 269–74.

[8] So Duhm, Driver-Gray, Fohrer, Horst (17,6–9), Pope, De Wilde; cf. also Hölscher ('frt dl') and Van Selms.

This symmetric arrangement of ideas corresponds with and is supported by a symmetric pattern of verbal repetitions; see anal. 3.4.5. Most of the words which constitute this symmetric pattern do not occur elsewhere in the poem. Of special importance, I think, are the external verbal repetitions in canticles I.3 and II.1; see *rwm* (‘to be high’), *r‘* (‘friend’), *‘yn* (‘eye’), *bn* (‘son’).

Curiously enough Habel fails to note the ‘concentric’ pattern in our chapters. According to this critic the poem displays a *linear* arrangement of themes: complaint (16,6–17), cry (16,18–17,1), complaint (17,2–10), cry (17,11–16); cf. anal. 3.5. The correspondence between the cries of 16,18–17,1 and 17,11–16 is said to show a chiastic pattern (p. 269). And according to Clines, Habel is ‘certainly right’ on this point (p. 375). However, the chiastic correspondences claimed by Habel between 16,18–17,1 and 17,11–16 are, in my view, much too vague. Moreover, they also lack a formal counterpart. In this respect the scheme of Clines himself (a.b.c|c’.a’.b’, p. 375; see anal. 3.5) does more justice to the rhethorical structure of chs. 16–17, because this formal pattern stresses the relationship between 16,18–22 and 17,1–5. According to Weiser, Job’s supplication ‘Gott selbst möge sich für ihn verbürgen bei sich selber’ (cf. 17,3) corresponds to 16,19–21 (p. 130).[10]

The arguments for the more exact demarcation of the canticles are especially provided by the analysis of the verbal repetitions described in anal. 3.4.4; note *’k ‘th/gm ‘th*, the nouns *‘d* (‘witness’), *’rṣ* (‘earth’), the root *gbr* (‘to be superior’) in canto I, and *ywm* (‘day’), *n’*, *my* (‘who?’), *yd* (‘hand’),

---

[9] The line of 17,3 is not a pledge of Job’s integrity (Habel), and the ‘witness in heaven’ Job is searching for in 16,19 must be God Himself (see Andersen on 17,3) and is not ‘Job’s own protestation of innocence’ (Clines, p. 390). The lines concerned represent ‘ein paradoxer Appell von Gott an Gott selber’ (Hölscher). See further below, about the pivot function of 16,19–17,5.

[10] See also König (p. 178), Möller (p. 51: ‘16,18–17,4 Mein Zeuge im Himmel müßte für mich eintreten’), Andersen (p. 179); and cf. Clines (p. 394)—against Horst (p. 259). Note, however, also Horst (p. 245): ‘Wunsch und Bitte bleiben … die richtunggebenden Markierungen’.

śkl (‘insight’)/*ḥkm* (‘to be wise’), *pnym* (‘face’) in canto II. See for canticles II.1–3 also Ley, Terrien, TOB and Clines in anal. 3.5. The linear pattern of these verbal repetitions does not stand alone, but has a thematic component too. The first lines of canto I (16,7–8) deal with the ‘seeming witness’ (cf. v. 8a) against Job. The idea of outward appearances recurs in the first lines of canticle I.2 (16,15–17; cf. Horst and Habel). The ‘witness’ literally recurs in the first line of canticle I.3 (16,19). The second parts of these canticles all contain more or less explicit references to Job’s actual distress and its consequences (see 16,9–14, 18 and 22). Because of this linear pattern of ideas, 16,18 does not belong with the following verses, as scholars almost universally assume (cf. anal. 3.5).[11] The mention of Job’s ‘blood’ (v. 18a) is an allusion to the attacks of 16,9–14. The appeal to the earth not to cover his blood even suggests that Job expects to die before his vindication by God will be implemented (Andersen, Clines). This idea is in harmony with the imagery of mourning rituals in vv. 15–16 and do not match the theme of the following verses at all. The poet deliberately works up to the low point of 16,18 to finally end the first canto in a definitely positive note; see 16,19–22. After the low point of v. 18 the proclamation of hope in the following verses, introduced by the emphatic device of transition *gm ‘th hnh*,[12] forms the concluding counterpoint of the first main part of the poem. For v. 18 as the last line of canticle I.2 see also *’rṣ* in anal. 3.4.4 and the alliteration described in anal. 3.4.2.

Such a linear pattern of ideas can also be observed in canto II. The first lines of this canto (17,1–2) deal with Job’s impending end and the provocations of his enemies. These ideas recur in the first lines of canticles II.2 and II.3; see anal. 3.2. Clines rightly observes that 17,6 returns to the theme of v. 2, while 17,7 resumes the theme of v. 1 (p. 395). So the lines involved form a chiastic pattern. The first lines of canticle II.3, however, match this pattern too: 17,11 is externally // vv. 7 and 1; and 17,12 is externally // vv. 6 and 2 (scheme: a.b|b’.a’|a”.b”). This framework also provides us with an explanation for the function and meaning of 17,12. Pope regards the line as misplaced. Dhorme, Gordis, Habel and Clines make it a subordinate clause modifying the *mwršy lbby* (‘desires of my hart’) in the preceding verse. The rhetorical analysis, however, makes clear that the line is to be taken as a relatively independent sentence and that the subject of *yśymw* must be Job’s scorners. In the second parts of canticles II.1 and II.2 we come across the idea of the friends’ lack of wisdom; note 17,4a and 10b. The final lines of canticle II.3 form an allusion to 17,3. In 17,13–15 Job emphasizes that there is no hope left for him. But the use of rhetorical questions in v. 15 suggests 'an inability to put the hope entirely from his mind' (Clines). This idea corresponds to Job's prayer in 17,3–5 that God will vouch for him as his only refuge, because his 'friends' do not understand his distress. Note also *my* ('who?') in 17,3b and 15b (anal. 3.4.4).

---

[11] But see Schlögl and KBS in anal. 3.5.

[12] Note also the chiastic word order in the bicolon; Kroeze.

The symmetric overall structure of the poem also comes to light when we observe and compare the length of the canticles in each of the cantos. The first canto opens with an eight-line canticle. This canticle is followed by two shorter, identical canticles of four lines. To some degree the canticle pattern of canto II mirrors the canticle pattern of canto I. The second canto opens with two identical canticles of five lines. In this case, these canticles are followed by a longer canticle of six lines.

Given the skeleton of the poem on the level of the cantos and the canticles, its strophic structure (strophes of two and three lines) is suggested by the mutual relationship of thematic and formal considerations; see especially analyses 3.2, 3.4.3 (for canto II) and 3.3.1–2. For 16,2–4b and 4c–6 see also Skehan, Fohrer and MacKenzie; for the strophic structure of canto II also Terrien (anal. 3.5).

The rhetorical structure of chs. 16–17 as a whole indicates that the *main thought* of the poem is to be found in the pivotal canticles, canticles I.3 and II.1. In these canticles Job expresses his confidence that *God will justify him before he descends into the underworld.*[13] Job's 'eyes' (16,20b and 17,2b) are turned towards his 'friends' (note *r*', in 16,20a.21b) and towards God on 'high' (16,19b). And it is his firm conviction that God will not 'make high' (17,4b) his scorners, who are deprived of insight.

---

[13] Cf. W.A. Irwin, 'Job's Redeemer', *JBL* 81 (1962), pp. 217–29 and J. Briggs Curtis, 'On Job's Witness in Heaven', *JBL* 102 (1983), pp. 549–62.

4 Bildad’s second speech: Job 18

Structure: 3 6.6.5 > 3 3.3|3.3|3.2

A	[2] *‘d ’nh tśymwn qnṣy lmlyn*	*tbynw w’ḤR ndbr*	
	[3] *mdw‘ nḥšbnw kbhmh*	*nṭmnw b‘ynykm*	
	[4] *ṭrp npšw b’pw*	*hlm‘nk t‘zb ’rṣ*	*wy‘tq ṣwr mMQMW*
I	[5] *gm ’WR rš‘ym yd‘k*	*WL’ ygh šbyb ’šw*	
	[6] *’WR ḤŠK b’hlw*	*wnrw* **‘lyw** *yd‘k*	
	[7] *yṣrw ṣ‘dy ’WNW*	*wtšlykhw ‘ṣtw*	
	[8] *ky šlḥ bršt brglyw*	*w‘l śbkh ythlk*	
	[9] *Y’ḤZ b‘qb pḥ*	*yḥzq* **‘lyw** *ṣmym*	
	[10] *ṭmwn b’rṣ ḥblw*	*wmlkdtw ‘ly ntyb*	
II	[11] *sbyb b‘thw* **blhwt**	*whpyṣhw lrglyw*	
	[12] *yhy r‘b ’NW*	*w’yd nkwn lṣl‘w*	
	[13] *y’kl bdy ‘wrw*	*y’kl bdyw bkwr mwt*	
	[14] *yntq m’hlw mbṭḥw*	*wtṣ‘dhw lmlk* **blhwt**	
	[15] *TŠKWN b’hlw mbly lw*	*yzrh ‘l nwhw gpryt*	
	[16] *mtḥt šršyw ybšw*	*wmm‘l yml qṣyrw*	
III	[17] *zkrw ’bd mny ’rṣ*	*WL’ šm lw* **‘l** *pny ḥwṣ*	
	[18] *yhdphw m’WR ’l ḤŠK*	*wmtbl yndhw*	
	[19] **l’** *nyn lw WL’ nkd b‘mw*	*w’yn śryd bmgwryw*	
	[20] **‘l** *ywmw nšmw ’ḤRNYM*	*wqdmnym ’ḤZW ś‘r*	
	[21] *’k ’lh MŠKNWT ‘wl*	*wzh MQWM* **l’** *yd‘ ’l*	

4.1 Text

V. 2a—*qnṣy*: pl. cs. of *qṣ* ‘end’, an Aramaizing dissolving of the gemination by the insertion of a *n* (HAL, Clines)

V. 2–3: the grammatical forms in these verses create the impression that Bildad addresses more than one person (note *tśymwn*, *tbynw* and *b‘ynykm*). Is Bildad speaking here to the other friends (Hölscher, Horst), or is he using plural forms in order to avoid a too personal attack on Job (Pope, Van Selms, Habel)?

V. 3b—*nṭmnw*: 'we are stupid', niph'al of *ṭmm* (so HAL; cf. Schlottmann, Budde, Hölscher, NBG, Horst, KBS, Van Selms, Clines, and also BHS). MT reads *nṭmynw* ('we are unclean').

V. 12a: 'his wealth is hungry' (to accumulate a bigger fortune). Some critics take *'n* as 'calamity' (// *'yd* in v. 12b); anal. 4.4.4, however, supports the interpretation 'strength, wealth', which creates an antithetic parallelism in v. 12.

V. 14b—*wtṣ'dhw*: 'and she will make him march'; so MT. We are perhaps dealing here with a 3 masc. pl. *taqtulū* form used in a passive sense: 'he is marched off'; cf. W.L. Moran, *JCS* 5 (1951), pp. 33–35 and —, *Biblica* 45 (1964), p. 82 n. 1 (Blommerde, Habel, Hartley, Clines).

V. 15a—*mbly lw*: 'what is not his'; so MT (Horst and Hartley). This reading is uncertain because one expects a parallel expression to *gpryt* (v. 15b). Some follow a proposal by M. Dahood, *Biblica* 38 (1957), pp. 312–14 and read *mbl* ('fire') in stead of *mbly* (so Pope, Habel, Clines; cf. BHS and Gordis).

4.2 Content

Portrayal of the misfortune of a wealthy evildoer.

A Introduction: Bildad complains about the unworthy manner of discussion (formal attack on the words of the other friends and/or Job; personal address).

I A wicked man's life is full of trouble (metaphorical description).
  The prosperity of the wealthy evildoer surely dwindles (image of extinguishing *light*; vv. 5–7).
  He is encountering innumerable difficulties on the path of his life (image of *traps*; vv. 8–10).

II He is heading for his destruction (metaphorical description).
  From all sides he himself and his wealth are surrounded by fatal dangers (mythological images of *Death*; vv. 11–13).
  He himself and his dwelling place will be destroyed (vv. 14–16; image of a withering *plant*—v. 16).

III There will be no memory of the evildoer (subjective reaction/conclusion).
  The memory of the wicked man will be totally effaced after his destruction (vv. 17–19).
  People will be appalled at his fate (vv. 20–21).

4.3 Transition markers

4.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

4.3.1.1 *‘d ‘nh*, v. 2a; ext. // *mdw‘* in v. 3a and *h*- interr. in v. 4b

4.3.1.2 *gm*, v. 5a (Vetter)
rš‘, v. 5a

4.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

4.3.2.1 *lm‘n*, v. 4b
zh, v. 21b

4.3.2.2 *’k*, v. 21a
’lh, v. 21a

4.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

no remarks

4.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

4.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’hl*, vv. 6, 14, 15; *’wn*, vv. 7, 12; *’wr*, vv. 5, 6, 18; *’ḥz*, vv. 9, 20; *’ḥr*, v. 2, 20; *’kl*, vv. 13, 13; *’rṣ*, vv. 4, 10, 17
b: *b*-, vv. 3, 4, 6, 8, 8, 9, 10, 15, 19, 19; *bd*, vv. 13, 13; *blhh*, vv. 11, 14
d: *d‘k*, vv. 5, 6
h: -*hw*, vv. 7, 11, 11, 14, 15, 18, 18
w: -*w*, vv. 4 (3×), 5, 6 (3×), 7, 7, 8, 9, 10, 10, 11, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 14, 15, 15, 16, 16, 17, 17, 19 (3×), 20
ḥ: *ḥšk*, vv. 6, 18
l: *l*-, vv. 2, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19; *l’*, vv. 5, 17, 19, 19, 21
m: *mn*, vv. 4, 14, 15, 16, 16, 17 (*mny*), 18, 18
‘: *‘l*, vv. 6, 8, 9, 10 (*‘ly*), 15, 17, 20
ṣ: *ṣ‘d*, vv. 7, 14
q: *qwm*, vv. 4, 21
r: *rgl*, vv. 8, 11
š: *škn*, vv. 15, 21

4.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–4: *l*-, vv. 2a.4b—inclusio
b-, vv. 3b.4a

vv. 5–7:	*’wr*, vv. 5a.6a (Vetter, Hontheim, Peters); see also *šbyb ’š* in v. 5b and *nr* in v. 6b! (Watson)	
	ydʻk, vv. 5a.6b! (Hontheim, Watson)	
vv. 8–10:	*b-*, vv. 8a (2×).9a.10a	
	ršt … śbkh/pḥ … ṣmym/ḥbl … mlkdt, vv. 8, 9 and 10 resp. (Watson: tour; cf. Vetter)	
	ʻl, vv. 8b.9b.10b (*ʻly*)	
vv. 11–13:	*lrglyw/lṣlʻw*, vv. 11b and 12b resp.—exactly linear (alliter.)	
vv. 14–16:	*mn*, vv. 14a.15a.16a+b	
	’hlw, vv. 14a.15a (Hontheim; Vetter: anadiplosis); see also *nwhw* in v. 15b (cf. Job 5,24)	
	-hw, vv. 14b.15b	
	l-, vv. 14b.15a	
	blhwt/b’hlw mbly lw, vv. 14b and 15a resp.—alliteration	
vv. 17–19:	*mn*, vv. 17a (*mny*).18a	
	wl’, vv. 17b.19a—inclusio	} chiasm
	lw, vv. 17b.19a!—inclusio	
vv. 20–21:	*wqdmnym/mqwm*, vv. 20b and 21b respectively—alliteration	

4.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 5–10 (canto I):	*ʻlyw*, vv. 6b.9b!—linear	
	ṣʻd/rgl, vv. 7a and 8a resp.—concatenatio (cf. Vetter)	
vv. 11–16 (canto II):	*-hw*, vv. 11a+b.14b+15b—linear	
	blhwt, vv. 11a.14b!—linear	} ‘chiasm’
	rgl/ṣʻd, vv. 11b and 14b resp.—linear	
vv. 17–21 (canto III):	*šm/nšmw*, vv. 17b and 20a resp. (alliter.)—linear	
	ʻl, vv. 17b.20a—linear	
	l’, vv. 17b+19a (2×).21b	
	mgwrym/mšknwt, vv. 19b and 21a resp.—linear	

4.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–4.20–21, inclusio:	*’ḥr*, vv. 2b.20a!
	mqwm, vv. 4c.21b! (Watson, Habel); see also *wqdmnym* in v. 20b (alliteration)

vv. 5–7.11–13.17–19: *’wr*, vv. 5a+6a.18a!; see also *‘wrw* in v. 13a (alliteration; Fokkelman)
wl’, vv. 5b.17b+19a!
šbyb/sbyb, vv. 5b.11a!
ḥšk, vv. 6a.18a!
’wnw, vv. 7a.12a!

vv. 8–10.14–16.20–21: *’ḥz*, vv. 9a.20b!
wmlkdtw/lmlk, vv. 10b.14b—alliteration
bkwr mwt/bmgwryw, vv. 13b and 19b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
škn, vv. 15a.21a!; note *tškwn/mšknwt*—alliter.

vv. 5–10.11–16: *ṣ‘d . . . rgl/rgl . . . ṣ‘d*, vv. 7–8 and 11+14 resp.—chiasm
vv. 14–16.17–19: *mn*, vv. 14–16.17–18—concatenatio
vv. 5–7.20–21: *rš‘/‘wl*, vv. 5a and 21a resp.!—inclusio (cf. Job 27,7); see also *l’ yd‘ ’l* in v. 21b!

4.4.5 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

4.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration
’hl (v. 6), *b-*, *-hw*, *mn* (v. 4), *‘l* (v. 15)

4.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*’kl*), *’rṣ*, (*bd*), *-w*

4.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–4.5–6.7–10|11–13.14–15.16–19.20–21 (3.2.4|3.2.4.2)
Stickel (1842): 2–3|4–7.8–11.12–15.16–19|20–21 (2|4×4|2)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–4.5–7.8–11|12–14.15–17.18–21 (10.10 > 3.3.4|3.3.4)
Ewald (1854): 2–4.5–11.12–18.19–21 (3.7.7.3)
Merx (1871): 2–4a.4b–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–18.19–21 (7×6)
Hitzig (1874): 2–3|4|5–7.8–10.11–13|14–16.17–19|20–21 (2|1|3.3.3|3.3|2)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–3.4–7.8–11.12–15.16–19.20–21 (4.9.8.8.8.4)
Wright (1883): 2–3.4.5–7.8–10.11–14.15–18.19–21 (4.3.6.6.8.8.6)
Dillmann (1891): 2–4 (’Eingang‘) 5–7.8–11.12–14.15–17.18–20 21 (’Schluss‘) (7 6.8.6.6.6 2)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.4b–5.6–7.8+9b+11a.12–13.14+17a+18a.19a+17b+19b+15a.20–21
Ley (1895): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–16.17–19.20–21 (6×3.2)

Duhm (1897): 2–3.17,8–9.17,10a+18,4|5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13b+14b–15.16–17.18–19.20–21
Vetter (1897): 2–4|5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–21
Hontheim (1904): 2–6.7–11|12–15|16–18.19–21 (5.5|4|3.3)
Schlögl (1916): 2–6.7–11.12–16.17–21 (4×10)
Löhr (1920): 2–3.4–5.7–8.10+9|11–12.13b+14b–15.17+19.20–21 (4×2|4×2)
Ball (1922): 2–3.4b–5.7–8.9–10.11–12.4a+13a+14.16–17.18–19.20–21
Peters (1928): 2–4|5–6.7–8.9–10.11–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21 (3|3×2.3.4×2)
König (1929): 2–4.5–11.12–17.18–21
Kissane (1939): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14+18+15.16–17+19.20+17,8+18,21 (7×3)
Irwin (1946): 2–3.4|5–7.8–10.11–13|14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21
Möller (1955): 2–3.4–12.13–21 (2.9.9 or 2.1.8.8.1)
Skehan (1961): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11+12b+13b–14.15–17.18–20.21 (6×3.1); similarly MacKenzie (1990)
Fohrer (1963): 2–3+4b–c|5–7.8–10.11–13.14–16.17–19|20–21 (3|5×3|2)
Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–11|12–13.14–16|17–18.19–21
Horst (1968): 2–4.5–12.13–20.21 (3|2.4.2|2.4.2|1); cf. Möller (1955)
TOB (1978): 2–4|5–21
KBS (1980): 2–6.7–10.11–14.15–19.20–21
De Wilde (1981): 3–4.17,8–9.18,5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.18+15.17+19.20–21
Van Selms (1982): 2–4.5–10.11–15.16–21
Webster (1983): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–17.18–21 (4×3.4.4)
Watson (1984), pp. 373–78: 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–14.15–19.20–21
Habel (1985): 2–4||5–6|7–11.12–14.15–16.17–20|21 (vv. 5–6 and 21 didactic sayings)
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–4.5–6.7–8.9–10||11–13.14–16|17–19.20–21 (3.3×2||3.3|3.2)
Hartley (1988): 2–4|5–10.11–21
Clines (1989): 2–4||5–7|8–10|11–13.14|15–17|18–20.21 (3|3.3.4.3.4; v. 14 pivot and v. 21 summary, p. 413)

4.6 Comments and summary

The main body of the poem—the description of the fate of the wicked—is again opened by an introductory unit, vv. 2–4 (cf. 15,17–19 and 16,2–6).[1] This introductory unit forms a three-line strophe and can be distinguished from the following verses by the personal address (which does not occur in vv. 5–21) and the formal judgement of the words of the other partners in dialogue (as opposed to the ‘inhaltliche Widerlegung’; König).

---

[1] So also Ewald, Dillmann, Vetter, Peters, König, Irwin, Fohrer, Horst, TOB, Van Selms, Watson, Habel, Hartley, Clines.

From v. 5 onwards, however, the *main breaks* in this second speech by Bildad are not to be discerned as clearly as one might wish. Vetter already observed: ‘Logische Gliederung enthält die Rede jedenfalls in ihrem zweiten und Haupt-Theile nicht. Dafür aber hat der Dichter die äusserliche Marksteine der Strophik in dieser Rede um so zahlreicher gesetzt’ (p. 39). As far as the overall structure of the poem is concerned this observation is corroborated by anal. 4.5. Köster, Löhr, Bezuidenhout and Hartley put a main caesura between vv. 10 and 11 (cf. Van Selms), Schlottmann between vv. 11 and 12 (cf. König and Terrien), Möller and Horst between vv. 12 and 13, Irwin between vv. 13 and 14. Others totally refrain from a division into main parts.[2] The analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem in its entirety makes it clear that the main body of the poem divides into three almost identical cantos of six, six and five lines respectively; cf. the divisions by König and Van Selms in anal. 4.5. The responsions concerned especially mark the beginning of the first and the third canto; see *’wr* (‘light’), *wl’* (‘and not’), *ḥšk* (‘to be dark’) in anal. 4.4.4. The ‘beginning’ of canto II is indicated by *’wn* (‘wealth) in vv. 7 and 12. The second canto, however, actually begins with v. 11. This is especially suggested by the repetition of *blhwt* (‘terrors’) in vv. 11 and 14 (anal. 4.4.3) and by the shift from the trap metaphor (vv. 8–10) to the mythological images of Destruction and Death (see anal.4.2; cf. Clines); see also below, about the strophic structure of the poem. The end of the cantos is marked by the responsions *’ḥz* (‘to seize’) and *škn* (‘to dwell’). The metaphorical description in v. 16 suggests that this line belongs with the preceding unit. Canto III, then, distinguishes itself from the preceding cantos by the use of non-metaphorical language.

Given this framework of the poem on the level of the cantos, I agree with Clines that the strophic structure is easy to discern. Fohrer more accurately notes that the strophes ‘sich öfters durch den Inhalt oder *durch die verwendeten Bilder* deutlich voneinander abheben’ (p. 299; italics are mine, PvdL). For the most part the cantos fall into three-line strophes.[3] In vv. 5–6 we meet the image of the extinguishing light. The noun *’wn* in v. 7 suggests that the line concerned belongs with this strophe too (see anal. 4.4.4). The word-pair *ṣʿd/rgl* in vv. 7–8 lends insufficient support to the conclusion that we are dealing with one strophe (against Vetter and Horst;

---

[2] So Stickel, Merx, Wright, Dillmann, Vetter, Peters, Skehan, Fohrer, Weiser, TOB, Clines.

[3] So also Ley, Kissane, Skehan, Fohrer, MacKenzie; cf. Webster.

see Clines); cf. canto II. The pair creates a formal tension between successive strophes—concatenatio.[4] V. 8 introduces a new image: the trap metaphor. The three-line strophes in the second canto are especially indicated by *linear* verbal repetitions; see *blhwt* and *rgl/ṣ‘d* in anal. 4.4.3. According to Watson the repetition of *blhwt* forms an envelope figure (so also Andersen and Clines). Inclusio, however, does not play an important part in the poem on the level of the strophes and anal. 4.4.2 (note *’hl*) univocally shows that v. 14 belongs with v. 15. The correspondence between *bkwr mwt* (‘Death's Firstborn’)[5] and *mlk blhwt* (‘the King of Terrors’)[6] at the actual end of vv. 13 and 14 again creates a rhetorical tension between the successive strophes by concatenatio/enjambement (cf. *ṣ‘d/rgl* in canto I). The strophic division in canto III is again determined by the *linear* external repetitions described in anal. 4.4.3. That there will be no memory of the wicked man because he has no offspring is the leading idea of the first strophe, the subjective reaction of his fellow citizens the leading idea of the final strophe. The concluding line, v. 21, in this case (otherwise 5,27) belongs with the final strophe of canto III; see anal. 4.4.2, and *’ḥz* and *škn* in anal. 4.4.4.

The poem as a whole is dominated by the ‘habitation motif’ (Habel; so also Watson, p. 378). The inclusio by *mqwm* (‘place’) in vv. 4c and 21b formally underlines this basic unity; see also *’ḥr* in anal. 4.4.4.[7]

The nodal verse according to Clines is ‘clearly’ v. 4, in which Bildad counts on the ‘unshakeability of the moral order of retribution’ (p. 408). V. 14 forms ‘the pivot between the living and the postmortem experience of the wicked’ (Clines, p. 413). In my opinion, we find the *quintessential thought* of the poem in the first strophes of the cantos, vv. 5–7, 11–13 and 17–19. These strophes display a progressive development of ideas. Vv. 5–7 describe the fading away of the wicked man's prosperity (‘light’). Vv. 11–13 speak of deadly disasters trying to overwhelm him (note v. 13b). Vv. 17–19, finally, deal with the memory of the wicked man after his actual destruction. The second strophes in the cantos do not really provide new information about the fate of the wicked. The nouns ‘light’ and ‘darkness’ (roots *’wr* and *ḥšk*) constitute the key words of the poem (see vv. 5–7 and 17–19, especially v. 18a). With this word-pair Bildad ties in with Job’s lament about the hostile attitude of his friends in 17,12 (note *’wr qrwb mpny ḥšk* in v. 12b).[8]

---

[4] Cf. also the distribution of *rgl* and *ṣ‘d* in the following canto. Watson calls v. 7 a ‘connective couplet, linking stanzas II and III’ (p. 375).

[5] See N.M. Sarna, ‘The Mythological Background of Job 18’, *JBL* 82 (1963), pp. 315–18; J.B. Burns, ‘The identity of Death's First-Born (Job 18,13)’, *VT* 37 (1987), pp. 362–64; N. Wyatt, ‘The expression *b*^{e}*kôr māwet* in Job 18,13 and its mythological background’, *VT* 40 (1990), pp. 207–16; J.B. Burns, ‘The Mythological Background to Job 18,5–16, *Bibbia e Oriente* 32 (1991), pp. 129–40. Burns identifies *bkwr mwt* in Job 18,13 with Namtar, the Mesopotamian god of plague and pestilence; Wyatt proposes an identification with Ugaritic Mot, ‘El's firstborn’.

[6] Cf. J. Day, *Molech. A God of Human Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 41), Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1989.

[7] Against Clines, who fails to detect ‘explicit links’ between vv. 2–4 and 5–21 (p. 407).

On the basis of this rhetorical analysis I find that Bildad’s second speech displays many (formal) similarities with his first speech in ch. 8. In the two poems the three-line strophes form the basic building blocks of the macrostructure. This macrostructure is determined by cantos of six lines. The poems open with *‘d ’n*/*‘d ’nh* (‘how long?’).[9] The root *’ḥr* plays a part on the level of the overall structure of ch. 18 as well as of ch. 8. The first canto of ch. 18 ends with the noun *ntyb* (‘path’). This winding up matches that of the second and the third cantos of ch. 8; see *’rḥ* and *drk* in 8,13 and 19 respectively. Cf. also *yḥzq*/*yḥzyq* in 18,9 and 8,15.20 resp., *mbṭḥw* (‘his trust’) in 18,14 and 8,14, *nwh* (‘dwelling’) in 18,15 and 8,6.

---

[8] Cf. also *ṭrp* … *’pw* in 18,4 with 16,9, *gm* in 18,5 with 16,19, *yṣr* in 18,7 with 17,7, *ythlk* in 18,8 with 16,6.22.

[9] See also the beginning of the following poem, ch. 19.

5 Job’s second reply to Bildad: Job 19

Structure: 4 14.10 > 4 7.7|5.5 > 2.2 3.2.2|3.2.2||3.2|3.2

A	2	*‘d ’nh twgywn npšy*	*wtdk’wnny bmlym*	
	3	*zh ‘śr p‘mym tklymwny*	*l’ tbšw thkrw ly*	
	4	*w’p ’mnm šgyty*	*’ty tlyn mšwgty*	
	5	*’m ’mnm ‘ly tgdylw*	*wtwkyḥw ‘ly ḥrpty*	
I.1	6	**d‘w** *’pw KY ’LWH ‘wtny*	*wmṣwdw ‘ly hqyp*	
	7	*hn ’ṣ‘q ḥms wl’ ’‘nh*	*’šw‘ w’yn mšpṭ*	
	8	*’rḥy gdr wl’ ’‘bwr*	*w‘l ntybwty ḥšk yśym*	
	9	*kbwdy m‘ly hpšyṭ*	*wysr ‘ṭrt r’šy*	
	10	*ytṣny* SBYB *w’lk*	*wys‘ k‘ṣ tqwty*	
	11	*wyḥr ‘ly ’pw*	*wyḥšbny lw kṣryw*	
	12	*yḥd yb’w gdwdyw*	*wyslw ‘ly drkm*	*wyḥnw* SBYB *l’hly*
I.2	13	*’ḥy m‘ly hrḥyq*	*wYD‘y ’k ZRW mmny*	
	14	*ḥdlw qrwby wMYD‘y*	*škḥwny gry byty*	
	15	*w’mhty lZR tḥšbny*	*nkry hyyty b‘YNYhm*	
	16	*l‘bdy qr’ty wl’ y‘nh*	*bmw py ’tḥnn lw*	
	17	*rwḥy ZRH l’šty*	*wḥnty lbny bṭny*	
	18	*gm ‘wylym m’sw BY*	*’qwmh wYDBRW BY*	
	19	*t‘bwny kl mty swdy*	*wzh ’hbty nhpkw BY*	
II.1	20	*b*‘**wr bśry** *dbqh ‘ṣmy*	*w’tmlṭh b*‘**wr** *šny*	
	21	*ḥnny ḥnny ’tm r‘y*	*KY yd ’LWH ng‘h by*	
	22	*lmh trdpny kmw ’L*	**wmbśry** *l’ tśb‘w*	
	23	*my ytn ’pw wyktbwn mly*	*my ytn bspr wyḥqw*	
	24	*b‘ṭ brzl w‘prt*	*l‘d bṣwr yḥṣbwn*	
II.2	25	*w’ny YD‘TY g’ly ḥy*	*w’ḥrwn ‘l ‘pr yqwm*	
	26	*w’ḥr* **‘wry** *nqpw z’t*	**wmbśry** *’ḥzh* **’lwh**	
	27	*’šr ’ny ’ḥzh ly*	*w‘YNy r’w wl’ ZR*	*klw klyty bḥqy*

[28] *ky t’mrw mh nrdp lw* *wšrš DBR nmṣ’ BY*
[29] *gwrw lkm mpny ḥrb* *ky hmh ‘wnwt ḥrb* *lm‘n TD‘WN šdyn*

5.1 Text

V. 13a—*hrḥyq*: ‘He has put far’, so MT (Habel, Clines); most scholars follow LXX and read *hrḥyqw* (‘they are distant’).

Vv. 14–15: MT puts the principal distinctive of v. 14 at *grwby* and ends the verse with *škḥwny*. Since Reiske scholars have removed *gry byty* from v. 15a, which is overloaded, to complete v. 14; cf. also E. Kutsch, *VT* 32 (1982), pp. 466–67. König, NBG, NJPS retain the masoretic accentuation; so also R. Ratner, *ZAW* 102 (1990), pp. 238–51 (note pp. 246–51).

V. 20a—*b‘wr bśry*: ‘with the skin of my flesh’; this reading is proposed by Horst with reference to Lev. 13,2–4.11.38–39.43 (see also BHS). MT *b‘wry wbbśry* (so König, Gordis, Habel).

V. 20b: meaning obscure because the interpretation of *w’tmlṭh* is uncertain.

Vv. 25–27: not only in view of the theological implications but also with regard to the difficulties which arise in translating these verses, numerous emendations have been proposed. Scholars are presently inclined to take MT unaltered as the basis for the interpretation (cf. Habel). See also Möller (p. 48 n. *); Th.J. Meek, *VT* 6 (1956), pp. 100–03; and K. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (AOAT 219), Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1986, pp. 310–15.

V. 28b—*by*: nearly all scholars follow about 100 Hebrew Mss and the ancient versions and read *bw*. Analysis 5.4.5, however, supports MT; see also Rozelaar and Clines (‘it is simply a question of point of view’); cf. Hartley.

V. 29b—*hmh*: ‘these (acts)’; so Reiske, Budde, Driver-Gray, Horst, Gordis, Habel among others. MT *ḥmh* (‘anger’); so König, NBG, Kroeze.

V. 29c—*šdyn*: so K; Q *šdwn*. Meaning obscure: *š*- (relative pronoun) + *dyn* (‘judgment’)?; so Gordis, Hartley and Clines. Budde and Horst (among others) propose to read *yš dyn* (‘es gibt einen Richter’).

5.2 Content

Job’s ‘final’ declaration of his trust in God.

A Introduction: Job rejects the ‘comfort’ of his friends.
    Your words are insulting to me (vv. 2–3).
    Prove that I am wrong indeed (vv. 4–5).
I Job’s complaints about his miserable situation (*objective*).
    I.1 God himself makes him undeservedly suffer (siege metaphor).

God himself takes up a position against me (vv. 6–8).
He disintegrates me completely (vv. 9–10).
He attacks me in a raging fury (vv. 11–12).

I.2 Everybody turns away from him.
Nobody wants to have anything to do with me (vv. 13–15).
My subordinates do not listen to me anymore (vv. 16 and 18);
my condition makes my house-mates turn away from me in disgust (vv. 17 and 19; *parallelismus stropharum*).

II Job's desire for and expectation of a fair judgment (*subjective*).

II.1 Desire for understanding from men (cf. I.2).
Please, take pity on my physical suffering (vv. 20–22; personal address).
O that my words could be kept for later generations after my death (vv. 23–24).

II.2 His belief in a fair judgment by God (cf. I.1).
I am sure that God will give my life a turn for the better before it expires (vv. 25–27).
Then, you will be proved to be in the wrong (vv. 28–29; personal address, cf. vv. 21–22).

5.3 Transition markers

5.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

5.3.1.1 *‘d ’nh*, v. 2a
w- beginning line, v. 4a
’mnm, v. 4a; ext. // *’mnm* in v. 5a
imperative: *d‘w*, v. 6a
’pw, v. 6a
w- beginning line, v. 11a
’k, v. 13b
cohortative: *’qwmh*, v. 18b
my ytn, v. 23a
’pw, v. 23a
my ytn, v. 23b
w- beginn. line, v. 25a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in v. 26a
’ny, v. 25a
mh, v. 28a

5.3.1.2 no remarks

5.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

5.3.2.1 *zh*, v. 3a
tqwh, v. 10b
zh, v. 19b
‘d, v. 24b
*hmh**, v. 29b
lm‘n, v. 29c

5.3.2.2 *w-* beginning line*, v. 15a
lmh, v. 22a
’ny, v. 27a
imperative: *gwrw*, v. 29a

5.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

’p, v. 4a
hn, v. 7a
gm, v. 18a
imperat.: *ḥnny*, v. 21a (2×)
’tm, v. 21a
z’t, v. 26a
’mr, v. 28a

5.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

5.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’ḥr*, vv. 25, 26; *’lwh* (/ *’l*), vv. 6, 21, 22 (*’l*), 26; *’mnm*, vv. 4, 5; *’ny*, vv. 25, 27; *’pw*, vv. 6, 23
b: *b-*, vv. 2, 15, 16, 18, 18, 19, 20, 20, 21, 23, 24, 24, 27, 28; *bśr*, vv. 20, 22, 26
g: *gwr*, vv. 14*, 29
d: *dbr*, vv. 18, 28
w: *-w*, vv. 6, 11 (3×), 12, 16, 28
z: *zh*, vv. 3, 19; *zwr*, vv. 13, 15, 17, 27
ḥ: *ḥzh*, vv. 26, 27; *ḥnn*, vv. 16, 17, 21, 21; *ḥrb*, vv. 29, 29; *ḥšb*, vv. 11, 15
y: *-y*, vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 6, 8, 8, 9 (3×), etc.; *yd‘*, vv. 6, 13, 14, 25, 29
k: *k-*, vv. 10, 11, 22; *ky*, vv. 6, 21, 28, 29
l: *l-*, vv. 3, 11, 12, 15, 16, 16, 17, 17, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, 29; *l’*, vv. 3, 7, 8, 16, 22, 27
m: *mh*, vv. 22, 28; *-mw*, vv. 16, 22; *my*, vv. 23, 23; *mlh*, v. 2, 23; *mn*, vv. 9, 13, 13, 22, 26, 29
n: *-ny*, vv. 2, 3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 21 22; *nqp*, vv. 6, 26; *ntn*, vv. 23, 23
s: *sbyb*, vv. 10, 12
‘: *‘d*, vv. 2, 24; *‘wr*, vv. 20, 20, 26; *‘yn*, vv. 15, 27; *‘l*, vv. 5, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 25; *‘nh*, vv. 7, 16
q: *qwm*, vv. 18, 25
r: *rdp*, vv. 22, 28
š: *šgh*, vv. 4, 4

5.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *-ny*, vv. 2b.3a
vv. 4–5: *’mnm*, vv. 4a.5a!
-ty, vv. 4b.5b—‘rhyme’; see also *šgyty* and *’ty* in v. 4

vv. 6–8: cf. Lam. 3,7–9 (Habel)
ʿwh piʿel/*ʾyn mšpṭ*, vv. 6a and 7b resp.; cf. Job 8,3a and Lam. 3,35–36
ʿwh piʿel/*gdr*, vv. 6a and 8a resp.—inclusio; cf. Lam. 3,9
wlʾ ʾʿ-, vv. 7a.8a—linear
vv. 11–12: *-w*, vv. 11a+b (2×).12a
vv. 13–15: *w-* + root *ydʿ* + *-y*, vv. 13b.14a*
zwr, 13b.15a—inclusio
-ny, 13b.14b.15a
vv. 16–17: *ḥnn*, vv. 16b.17b
vv. 18–19: *by*, vv. 18b.19b—linear; see also *by* in v. 18a
vv. 20–22: *bśry*, vv. 20a.22b—inclusio
-ny, vv. 21a (2×).22a
ʾlwh/ʾl, vv. 21b and 22a respectively
vv. 23–24: *b-*, vv. 23b.24a+b
vv. 25–26: *ʾny*, vv. 25a.27a—inclusio!
gʾl/ʾlwh, vv. 25a and 26b resp.
w- + *ʾḥr(wn)*, vv. 25b.26a!
} chiasm
ʾḥzh, vv. 26b.27a!; see also *rʾh* in v. 27b!
vv. 28–29: *ky*, vv. 28a.29b

5.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 6–12 (I.1): *ʾpw/ʾpw*, vv. 6a and 11a resp. (alliter.)—linear
-w, vv. 6b.11–12—inclusio
ʾrḥ . . . ntyb/drk, vv. 8 and 12b resp.!—linear; see also *hlk* in v. 10a!
sbyb, vv. 10a.12c!—linear
k-, vv. 10b.11b—concatenatio
vv. 13–19 (I.2): *-ny*, vv. 13–15.19a—inclusio
zwr, vv. 15a.17a—linear; cf. also *zwr* in v. 13b
vv. 25–29 (II.2): *ydʿ*, vv. 25a.29c—inclusio (Webster)
mn, vv. 26b.29a

5.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 6–19 (canto I): *ydʿ*, vv. 6a.13b+14a*—linear
wlʾ ʾʿnh/wlʾ yʿnh, vv. 7a and 16a resp.!
root *ḥšb* + *-ny*, vv. 11b.15a!—‘concatenatio’

vv. 20–29 (canto II): *ʿwr*, vv. 20a+b.26a!—linear
ʿṣmy/klyty, vv. 20a and 27c resp.—linear

ky, vv. 21b.28a+29b—‘inclusio’
’lwh, vv. 21b.26b—linear; see also *’l* (‘God’) in v. 22a
mh, vv. 22a.28a!—‘inclusio’
rdp, vv. 22a.28a!—‘inclusio’ (Bezuidenhout, p. 210)
wmbśry, vv. 22b.26b—linear; see also *bśry* in v. 20a!
l’, vv. 22b.27b—exactly linear

5.4.5 Within the composition as a whole

vv. 2–5.20–24: *npšy/ ‘ṣmy*, vv. 2a and 20a resp.!; cf. Job 7,15
npšy/šny, vv. 2a and 20b resp.—alliteration
mlh, vv. 2b.23a!

vv. 6–12.20–24: *’pw*, vv. 6a.23a!; see also *’pw* in v. 11a
ky, vv. 6a.21b—linear
’lwh, vv. 6a.21b—linear; see also *’l* (‘God’) in v. 22a
wmṣwdw ‘ly/ dbqh ‘ṣmy, vv. 6b and 20a resp.—linear (alliter.)
’‘bwr/ b‘wr, vv. 8a and 20a+b resp. (alliter.)—linear
k- in vv. 10b+11b.22a!
kṣryw/ bṣwr, vv. 11b and 24b resp. (alliter.)—linear

vv. 13–19.25–29: *yd‘*, vv. 13b+14a*.25a+29c
zwr, vv. 13b+15a+17a.27b!
gwr in vv. 14b* and 29a!
‘ynym, vv. 15b.27b!—linear; cf. *zr* in vv. 15a and 27b—chiasm
dbr, vv. 18b.28b!—linear
by, vv. 18a+b+19b.28b—linear; but cf. also *by* in v. 21b
qwm, vv. 18b.25b!

vv. 6–8.25–29, inclusio: *yd‘*, vv. 6a.29c; cf. *rš‘/ ‘wl* in ch. 18
nqb, vv. 6b.26a!
’rḥy/ w’ḥrwn … w’ḥr, vv. 8a and 25–26 resp.! —alliteration

5.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

5.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
b-, *-w*, *ḥnn* (v. 21), *-y*, *l'* (vv. 3, 16), *mn*, *-ny*

5.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
zh, (*ḥrb*), *l-*, *-mw*, (*my*), (*ntn*), *'d*, *'l*, (*šgh*)

5.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–5.6–7.8–10.11–12|13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24.25–28.29 (4.2.3.2|4×2|2.2.4.1)

Stickel (1842): 2–6.7–12|13–16.17–20|21–22.23–24|25–29

Schlottmann (1851): 2–3.4–5||6–8.9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24.25–27.28–29 (4|7.8.9 > 2.2||3.2.2|4×2|2.2.3.2)

Ewald (1854): 2–3.4–5.6–12.13–19.20.21–22|23–29 (2.2.7.7.1.2|7)

Merx (1871): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–11|12*.13–15|16–17.18–20|21–22.23–25|26–27a.27b–29 (4.6|4.6|etc.)

Hitzig (1874): 2–5 6–11|12–14.15–17.18–20|21–22.23–24.25–27.28–29 (4 6|3.3.3|2.2.3.2)

Delitzsch (1876): 2–6.7–11.12–15.16–20.21–25.26–29 (6×10); cf. Merx (1871)

Wright (1883): 2–3|4–7.8–10.11–12|13–16.17–19.20–22|23–24.25–27b.27c–29 (4|8.6.5|8.6.6|4.6.6)

Dillmann (1891): 2–5|6–9.10–12.13–16.17–20|21–24.25–27|28–29 (8|8.7.9.8|8.7|5); cf. Dillmann (1869)

Bickell (1894): 2–3.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12a+c.13–14.15a–b+16.17–18.19–20.21–22.23+24b.25–26.27c–28a+29a–b

Ley (1895): 2–6.7–12.13–17.18–22.23–27.28–29 (5.6.3×5.2)

Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5 ('Anrede an die Freunde')|6–7.8–9.10–11.13–15a.15b–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24.25–26a.26b–27.28–29b; cf. Dillmann (1891)

Vetter (1897): 2–4.5–6|7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24|25–27|28–29

Hontheim (1904): 2–6+29.7–12|13–16|17–22.23–28 (6.6|4|6.6)

Budde (1913): 2–6.7–22.23–29

Schlögl (1916): 2–12b.12c–22.23–29 (22.22.16)

Löhr (1918): 2–3.6–7.8–9.10–11|13–14.15–16.17+19.21–22|23–24.x+25.26–27.28–29* (4×2|4×2|4×2)

Ball (1922): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22.23–24.25–26.27.28–29b

Peters (1928): 2–4.5–6|7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22. 23–24|25–27.28–29 (3.2|9×2|3.2 = 28)
König (1929): 2–6.7–19.20–29
Kissane (1939): 2–4+x+5–6.7–12.13–18|19+23–27b.27c+28b+20–22+ 28a+29 (6.6.6|6.6)
Irwin (1946): 2–3|5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12b|13–14.15*–16.17–18.19–20|21–22. 23–24.25–26.27*–28 (2|4×2|4×2|4×2)
Möller (1955): 2–5.6–7.8–12.13–22.23–27.28–29 (4.2.5.10.5.2)
Skehan (1961): 2–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.13–17.18–22.23–25+27a–b+26b+27c. 28–29 (2.3.3.3.5.5.5.2)
Fohrer (1963): 2–4|5–8.9–12.13–16.17–20.21–24.25–27+x|28–29 (3|6×4|2$\frac{1}{2}$)
Terrien (1963): 2–3.4–6|7–9.10–12|13–16.17–18|19–22.23–24|25–27.28–29
Epping-Nelis (1968): 2–6.7–12.13–22.23–27.28–29; similarly Horst (1968); cf. Ley (1895)
Weiser (1968): 2–5.6–22.23–27.28–29
TOB (1978): 2–6|7–12|13–20|21–22.23–24|25–27.28–29
KBS (1980): 2–6.7–12.13–20.21–29
De Wilde (1981): 18,2+17,10.19,2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–12|13–15a.15b–16. 17–18.19–20.21–22.28–29b|23–24.25–26.27+29c
Van Selms (1982): 2–7.8–12.13–20.21–29
Webster (1983): 2–6.7–9.10–12.13–16.17–19.20–24.25–29
Habel (1985): 2–5.6–12.13–20.21–29; cf. KBS (1980)
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–4.5–7|8–9.10–12|13–16.17–20||21–22.23–24.25–27. 28–29
Hartley (1988): 2–6.7–12.13–20.21–27.28–29; cf. KBS (1980) and Habel (1985)
Clines (1989): 2–6.7–12.13–20.21–22.23–27.28–29 (5.6.8.2.5.2, 'the *strophic structure* does not display a regular pattern'; vv. 2–6.7–20.21–22. 23–27.28–29 > a.b.a'.b'.a"; a = address to the friends)
MacKenzie (1990): 2–3.4–6.7–9.10–12|13–15.16–19.20–22|23–27|28–29 (2.3×3|3.4.3|5|2)
Mende (1990), pp. 26–30: 2–6.8–11+13.14a+15b–19.21+23–24+28–29a+ 29c (4×5; a.b.b'.a')

5.6 Comments and summary

Analysis 5.5 shows that there hardly any consensus about the exact delimitation of main units in ch. 19. Especially the end of the poem seems to be structurally problematic, as it is problematic in other respects (see below). Critics generally agree that the poem opens with an introductory section, in which Job protests against the attacks by his friends. Most take

v. 6 as the end of this section, but according to others the section already winds up with v. 5. Next there follows a long complaint from v. 5/6 (?) onwards. This complaint obviously divides into two parts. There is also consensus about the fact that the first part of this complaint—about God's siege tactics—ends with v. 12. However, no common opinion can be found as to the final line of the second complaint, about friends and relatives turning away from Job. Most critics take v. 20 as the closing line of this complaint, while others take v. 22 as such. From v. 23 onwards Job speaks of his desire for and belief in a fair trial. Many consider vv. 28–29 as a unit which is relatively separated from the preceding one. On the basis of a rhetorical analysis, I think, we can univocally decide about some uncertainties concerning the structure of this poem. This approach also makes it possibe to refine the thematic analysis, by which some new light is shed on the specific development of the content.

The formal analysis of the verbal repetitions in the first place shows that the introductory unit does not end with v. 6, as is generally assumed, but with v. 5.[1] See especially *ky* and *'lwh* ('God') in anal. 5.4.5, *yd'* ('to know') in anal. 5.4.4 and the responsions in vv. 6–8 (anal. 5.4.2).[2] The beginning of the main body of the poem, then, is marked by the imperative *d'w* ('know'), followed by the emphatic particle *'pw*, v. 6 (anal. 5.3.1.1). As in vv. 2–5, Job explicitly addresses his friends here. As opposed to vv. 2–5, however, v. 6 deals with *God's* attacks against Job (see vv. 7–12), whereas vv. 2–5 protest against the attacks by the *friends.* Also from this thematic perspective v. 6 obviously belongs with vv. 7–12. The explicit, personal address to the friends might be taken as a form of concatenatio between the introductory unit and the first canto.[3]

The analysis of the responsions on the level of the poem as a whole further makes it clear that the main body of this composition falls into *two* cantos: vv. 6–19 and 20–29. This bipartite structure is especially indicated by the verbal repetitions that mark the end of the cantos; see especially *zwr* ('to turn aside from'), *gwr* ('to dwell as a client'/'to be afraid of'), *'ynym* ('eyes'), *dbr* ('to speak') and *qwm* ('to stand') in anal. 5.4.5. The words mentioned here do not occur anywhere else in the poem! This analysis also points out that vv. 28–29 do not represent an individual unit, separated from canto II.[4] The root *dbr* in combination with *by* ('in me') in v. 28b and the root *yd'* in v. 29c (see anal. 5.4.5) indicate that these lines form a close unit with vv. 25–27, comparable to vv. 13–19. See for v. 20 as the first line of canto I especially below. The first canto encompasses Job's complaints and can be characterized as an *objective* description of his distress. The second canto expresses Job's desire and conviction about his vindication. This canto can be seen as a *subjective* continuation of the preceding complaints (cf. anal. 5.2).

---

[1] So also Schlottmann, Ewald, Dillmann, Duhm, Möller, Weiser, Habel; against Clines, p. 436.

[2] For the special character of the introductory unit see part VI, 1.2.6.

[3] This example proves one more that the direction of address does not provide a clue for the structural analysis of the poetry in the book of Job; against Clines (see anal. 5.5). In any case, it is probable that the poem as a whole is addressed to the friends.

[4] Cf. Dillmann, Ley, Vetter, Möller, Skehan, Fohrer, Epping-Nelis, Weiser, Hartley,

From a thematic point of view the first canto divides into two identical canticles of seven lines each: vv. 6–12 (God's siege tactics) and 13–19 (Job's alienation from his friends). See also *yd'* ('to know') in anal. 5.4.4. According to MT the subject of v. 13a is God Himself; cf. vv. 6–12. This reading may be correct (cf. anal. 5.1) because it produces a smooth transition from the first to the second canticle—'rhetorical connection'; cf. the transition between vv. 2–5 and canto I described above. The second canticle winds up with v. 19. The line constitutes a summarizing statement concerning the intimates who have forsaken Job; note *kl mty swdy* ('all my intimates') and *zh 'hbty* ('those I loved'). The end of the first canto is perhaps marked by the device of epiphora; note *by* as the last word of vv. 18 and 19.

Canto II also divides into two identical canticles, vv. 20–24 and 25–29.[5] These canticles encompass five lines each and display a linear as well as a symmetric, rhetorical relationship. The two patterns do not contradict but, in a beautiful way, complement each other. The linear pattern is in the first place indicated by the verbal repetitions between vv. 20–22 and 25–27; see *'wr* ('skin'),[6] *bśry* ('my flesh'), *'lwh* ('God') and *l'* ('not') in anal. 5.4.4. This cluster of responsions especially supports the canticle division of canto II. The pattern also reveals that v. 20 does not belong with the preceding lines, but is to be taken as the first line of the second canto;[7] note *'wr* and *bśry*.[8] While the preceding unit is about Job's social distress, v. 20 explicitly describes his physical suffering, a theme that reminds us of the siege images of vv. 6–12. This summarizing, single line provides the special ground for Job's cry for mercy on the part of the friends in v. 21a; cf. also v. 21b with v. 6a. The symmetric pattern of canto II is suggested by the repetitions between vv. 20–22 and 28–29; see *ky*, *mh* ('what?'), and *rdp* ('to persecute') in anal. 5.4.4.

Clines, MacKenzie in anal. 5.5.

[5] So also Webster; cf. Stickel, Peters, Terrien and TOB in anal. 5.5.

[6] Cf. D.R. Blumenthal, 'A Play on Words in the nineteenth Chapter of Job', *VT* 16 (1966), pp. 497–501.

[7] Critics universally assume that the foregoing complaints end with v. 20 or v. 22; see anal. 5.5. But see König; and cf. also Ewald and Webster in anal. 5.5.

[8] See also the inclusio by *bśry* in anal. 5.4.2. Inclusio appears to be a hallmark of the three-line strophes in this poem; cf. the inclusions in vv. 6–8, 13–15 and 25–26!

This double structure in canto II also emerges on the basis of a thematic approach. In canticle II.1 (vv. 20–24) we find Job's *desire* for sympathy *from mankind*; note the wish formula *my ytn* (‘o that’) in v. 23a and b. Canticle II.2 (vv. 25–29) deals with Job's *conviction* that he will be justified *by God*; note *w'ny yd‘ty* (‘but I, I know’) in v. 25a. Next, vv. 23–24 point to the fact that Job has given up the hope to be vindicated before he dies. He wishes for his words to be carved in a rock so that a later generation will know about his righteousness. In vv. 25–27 we read about Job's conviction that he will ‘see’ his ‘redeemer’ before his death.[9] So, vv. 23–24 as well as vv. 25–27 deal with the idea of Job's justification. The verses which precede and follow vv. 23–27 deal with the attacks Job and his friends (will) endure from God. In v. 21b we read about God's attacks on Job and in v. 29 about God's attacks on the friends. So, apart from a linear development of content in canto II—from wish to conviction and from vindication after death to vindication before death—canto II shows a symmetric pattern of ideas, too. See also the personal addresses to the friends in vv. 21–22 and 28–29, and the imperatives in vv. 21 and 29.[10] The paradox which is produced by the idea of the successive units of vv. 23–24 and 25–27 (vindication after death and vindication before death) has to be explained as a means to emphasize the special idea of vv. 25–27. Job's wish in vv. 23–24 departs from the thought that he will die soon. From the perspective of Job's repeated claim of his innocence, this idea represents a low point in the progression of the content of the dialogues. Within the train of thought of ch. 19, however, vv. 23–24 underline Job's inconceivable faith in God who is attacking him from all sides. The poet makes use of a rhetorical chiaroscuro to put the quintessential theme of his composition in a clear light. The paradox between vv. 23–24 and 25–27 'lies at the core of Job's struggle'.[11]

---

[9] The interpretation of vv. 25–27 is very controversial. Does Job speak of the period before, or after his death? Much depends in this respect on the meaning of *mbśry* in v. 26b. Is Job pointing here to his seeing God ‘from within his flesh’ (i.e. while he is still alive) or ‘from without his flesh’ (i.e. after he has died). I follow the lead of Terrien and Habel (cf. also TOB) who have produced conclusive evidence for the former interpretation (similarly Budde, Dhorme, Peters, Hartley; cf. also Fohrer and Clines). Otherwise recently Spronk, who with reference to *‘l ‘pr* in 17,16 (see 19,25) maintains that Job speaks here of the time after his death; see K. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (AOAT 219), Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1986, pp. 312–13 (similarly Driver-Gray, Kroeze, Pope, Andersen). Cf. further Theresia Mende, ‘“Ich weiss, dass mein Erlöser lebt” (Ijob 19,25). Ijobs Hoffnung und Vertrauen in der Prüfung des Leidens’, *TTZ* 99 (1990), pp. 25 and 32–35; R. Althann, ‘Job and the idea of the beatific after-life’, *OTE* 4 (1991), pp. 316–26. However, the root *qwm* in combination with the prep. *‘l* may have a hostile meaning (see, e.g., Isa. 14,22 Amos 7,9 Job 25,3b; Van Selms). That is to say, God will rise *against* the underworld to deliver Job from his distress (19,25b). See for ‘dust’ as ‘underworld’ Job 7,21 10,9 17,16 20,11 21,26; so also N.H. Ridderbos, ‘*‘pr* als Staub des Totenortes’, *OTS* 5 (1948), pp. 174–78; Möller, p. 48; N.J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament* (Biblica et Orientalia 21), Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969, pp. 85–91 and Pope; cf. Weiser. Moreover, Spronk does not present a satisfactory explanation for the fact that the idea of post-mortem vindication has no repercussions in Job's following speeches (Spronk, *op.cit.*, p. 315). See also R. Martin-Achard, *La mort en face selon la Bible Hébraïque*, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1988, pp. 115–18. Martin-Achard rightly notes: ‘Si au chapitre 19, Job changeait d'avis, ... le dialogue aurait pu s'achever dans la prolongation d'une découverte quasi révolutionnaire. Il n'en est rien’ (p. 118); so also Hartley, p. 296.

[10] The personal addresses to the friends may have a function here, because this symmetric phenomenon coincides with other formal and thematic indications. The close-knit

When we now look at the train of thought in the main body of the poem (vv. 6–29), again, apart from a linear development of the content—from lament (canto I) to conviction (canto II)—a symmetric pattern of ideas may be observed. Canticle I.1 deals with *God's* attacks on Job; in canticle II.2 Job especially focuses on *God* as his vindicator. In canticle I.2 Job speaks about alienation from *mankind*; in canticle II.1 he especially focuses on *mankind's* understanding (cf. Bezuidenhout [1986], p. 210).

Taking for granted the framework of the poem on the level of the cantos and the canticles, the strophic structure is rather easy to discern. It is

---

rhetorical structure of vv. 20–29 militates against the literary critical interferences by Th. Mende, *art. cit.*, pp. 24–26. The symmetric pattern partially goes along with the 'chiastic' (concentric) design which Habel (pp. 297–98) and Clines (p. 436) have detected in vv. 21–29. According to the design of Habel and Clines, however, vv. 25–26a are supposed to represent the pivotal cola of the unit. Next, vv. 23–24 and vv. 26b–27 are supposed to enclose these pivotal cola and to correspond with each other from a thematic point of view: 'hope'/'desire'. The strophic analysis of the poem, however, indicates that the lines of vv. 25–27 form a close, self-contained unit (see below; so also Andersen, p. 194) and in their entirety depend on the introductory formula 'but I, I know' (v. 25a), which expresses Job's *conviction*. There is no reason to suppose that from v. 26b onwards Job assuages his belief by expressing mere wishes. The framework makes clear, according to Habel, that 'God remains one of Job's pursuers' (p. 297). I cannot agree with this view, nor with the rhetorical idea on which it is grounded.

[11] Hartley, p. 295. Cf. the transition within 16,18–19. The antithesis is indicated by adversative *w-* and the emphatic, personal pronoun *'ny* at the beginning of v. 25. Critics frequently attempt to argue away the paradox by assuming that the 'redeemer' of v. 25a is not God Himself (so Van Selms, Habel, Clines; see also Th. Mende, *art. cit.*, pp. 24–26). Vv. 25–27, however, 'are so tightly knit that there should be no doubt that the *Redeemer* is *God*' (Andersen, p. 194); so also Dhorme, Gordis, Fohrer and R. Kessler, '"Ich weiß, daß mein Erlöser lebet". Sozialgeschichtlicher Hintergrund und theologische Bedeutung der Löser-Vorstellung in Hiob 19,25', *ZTK* 89 (1992), pp. 139–58. Fohrer attempts to tone down the contrast by assuming that 'Hiob den Wunsch von V. 23f. zwar ausspricht, jedoch wegen der Hoffnung auf Gott sogleich wieder fallenläßt' (p. 317; see also p. 320).

obvious that in canto II vv. 23 and 28 should form the beginning of a new strophe; see anal. 5.2, 5.3.1 and 5.4.2 (note the inclusions in the three-line strophes). That is to say, the canticles open with a three-line strophe, which is followed by a strophe of two lines.[12] The same formal skeleton can be discerned in canto I: the canticles open with a three-line strophe each, which are followed by strophes of two lines. This pattern is based on a combination of thematic (anal. 5.2) and formal (anal. 5.3.1–2 and 5.4.2–3) arguments.[13] For the strophic structure of vv. 2–5 see anal. 5.2, 5.3.1.1 and 5.4.2.[14]

It is generally agreed that from v. 23 onwards we arrive at the *main thought* of the poem. The rhetorical analysis indicates that this main thought is to be found in the second part of the cantos, vv. 13–19 and 25–29, especially in vv. 25–29 (note v. 25). Job feels abandoned by his friends and relatives (vv. 13–19), he knows, however, that in the end *God will be on his side* and will turn against his human opponents (that is to say at this side of the border of Sheol; vv. 25–29).

In ch. 19 Job somehow takes up the preceding speech by Bildad, I think. It is safe to say that there is a formal connection between the two poems on the basis of some obvious verbal repetitions. See in the first place the correspondences in the introductory units: *‘d ’nh* in 19,2 and 18,2, *npš* in 19,2 and 18,4, *mlh* in 19,2 and 18,2.[15] Some of these repetitions may also point to a thematic connection. This applies to the root *’ḥr*, I think. Cf. especially the mysterious *’ḥrwn* at the end of ch. 19 (v. 25) with the rhetorically important *’ḥrwnym* at the end of ch. 18 (v. 20). Note also that Job's ‘skin’ (vv. 20 and 26) resembles the ‘skin’ of the wicked (18,13).

---

[12] Habel and Clines take v. 26a as the third colon of v. 25. V. 26a is ‘explanatory’, according to Habel, ‘especially in view of the literary design’ (p. 293). In my opinion, the literary design does not lead to suppose that the masoretic verse division has to be adjusted. The strophe of vv. 25–27 winds up with a tricolon; cf. vv. 11–12 and 28–29.

[13] The recurring strophic patterns speak against the literary critical interferences by Th. Mende (*art. cit.*, pp. 15–25).

[14] So, the strophic structure of this poem displays a fine, regular pattern; cf. Clines in anal. 5.5. See for the strophic structure of vv. 2–5 also Ewald, Duhm, Ball, De Wilde; for the strophic structure of vv. 2–12 and 23–29 also Schlottmann and for the strophic structure of vv. 20–29 MacKenzie. According to Habel vv. 6–12 (canticle I.1) also display a concentric design, with v. 9 as the pivotal line. The arguments, however, which are supposed to support this pattern are, in my view, not conclusive; see also the *linear* repetitions described in anal. 5.4.3.

[15] Note furthermore *mṣwd* (‘Netz’; HAL) in 19,6 and the trap metaphor in 18,8–10, *ntyb* in 19,8 and 18,10, *ḥšk* in 19,8 and 18,6.18, *sbyb* in 19,10.12 and 18,11, *’pw* in 19,11 and 18,4, *’hl* in 19,12 and 18,6 etc., *gwr* in 19,14 and 18,19, *‘wr* in 19,20.26 and 18,13, *ṣwr* in 19,24 and 18,4, *’ḥrwn* in 19,25 and 18,20, *’ḥr* in 19,26 and 18,2, *qwm* in 19,18.25 and 18,4.21, *šrš* in 19,28 and 18,16, *lm‘n* in 19,29 and 18,4.

6 Zophar’s second speech: Job 20

Structure: 2 8.8.10 > 2 3.3.2||3.3.2||2.2|3.3

A	[2]	*lkn ś‘py YŠYBWny*	*wb‘bwr ḥwšy by*	
	[3]	*mwsr klmty ’šm‘*	*wrwḥ mbynty y‘nny*	

I	[4]	*hZ’T YD‘T mny ‘d*	*mny śym ’DM ‘ly ’RṢ*	
	[5]	*ky rnnt RŠ‘YM mQRWB*	*wśmḥt ḥnp ‘dy rg‘*	
	[6]	*’M y‘lh lŠMYM śy’w*	*wr’šw l‘b ygy‘*	
	[7]	*kgllw lnṣḥ y’bd*	*R’YW y’mrw ’yw*	
	[8]	*kḥlwm y‘wp wl’ ymṣ’whw*	*wydd kḥzywn lylh*	
	[9]	*‘yn šzptw wl’ twsyp*	*wl’ ‘wd tšwrnw mqwmw*	
	[10]	*bnyw yrṣw DLYM*	*wydyw TŠBNH ’wnw*	
	[11]	*‘ṣmwtyw ml’w ‘lwmw*	*w‘mw ‘l ‘pr tškb*	

II	[12]	*’M tmtyq bpyw r‘h*	*ykḥydnh tḥt* **lšwnw**	
	[13]	*yḥml ‘lyh wl’ y‘zbnh*	*wymn‘nh btwk ḥkw*	
	[14]	*lḥmw bm‘yw nhpk*	*mrwrt* **ptnym** *bQRBw*	
	[15]	**ḥyl bl‘** *wyq’nw*	*mbṭnw ywršnw ’l*	
	[16]	*r’š* **ptnym** *yynq*	*thrghw* **lšwn** *’p‘h*	
	[17]	*’l YR’ bplgwt nhry*	*nḥly dbš wḥm’h*	
	[18]	*MŠYB yg‘ wl’* **ybl‘**	**kḥyl** *tmwrtw wl’ y‘ls*	
	[19]	*ky rṣṣ ‘zb DLYM*	*BYT gzl wl’ ybnhw*	

III.1	[20]	*ky l’ YD‘ šlw bbṭnw*	*bḥmwdw l’ ymlṭ*	
	[21]	*’yn* **śryd l’klw**	*‘l kn l’ yḥyl ṭwbw*	
	[22]	*bml’wt śpqw yṣr lw*	*kl yd ‘ml tbw’nw*	
	[23]	*yhy lml’ bṭnw*	*yšlḥ bw ḥrwn* **’pw**	*wymṭr ‘lymw* *[blḥwmw*
III.2	[24]	*ybrḥ mnšq brzl*	*tḥlphw qšt nḥwšh*	
	[25]	*šlp wyṣ’ mgwh*	*wbrq mmrrtw yhlk*	*‘lyw ’mym*
	[26]	*kl ḥšk ṭmwn lṣpwnyw*	**t’klhw** *’š l’ npḥ*	*yr‘* **śryd** *b’hlw*

[27] *yglw ŠMYM ʻwnw* *w'RṢ mtqwmmh lw*
[28] *ygl ybl BYTw* *ngrwt bywm* **'pw**
[29] *ZH ḥlq 'DM RŠʻ m'lhym* *wnḥlt 'mrw m'l*

6.1 Text

V. 2b—*ḥwšy*: ‘my feeling’; from *ḥwš* (‘feel pain/joyful’)? HAL reads *yḥwšw* (‘sie sind schmerzvol’).

V. 17—*bplgwt nhry*: ‘in streams of oil’; so Blommerde (p. 90), Gordis, Habel; cf. also Clines. MT puts the principal distinctive with *bplgwt.*

V. 18a—*ygʻ*: ‘Arbeitsertrag’ (HAL, Clines).

V. 23c—*blḥwmw*: ‘in his heat/anger’ (so Gordis; cf. HAL); ‘in his flesh’ (Van Selms; cf. Zeph. 1,17). Dahood (*Biblica* 38 [1957], pp. 314–15) reads *mbl ḥmw* (‘the fire of his wrath’); so also Blommerde (p. 90)—cf. BHS.

V. 28a—*ygl ybl*: ‘a flood will sweep away’; so most critics and translations (Dhorme, Hölscher, De Wilde, Van Selms, Habel, Clines, among others). MT *ygl ybwl* (‘the produce [of his house] may be carried away’); so NBG, RSV.

6.2 Content

God Himself causes the destruction of the wicked.

A Introduction: my feelings urge me to speak my mind (vv. 2–3).

I The prosperity of the wicked is only temporary (observation of his doom).
    Bear in mind that the joy of the arrogant wicked is always short-lived (vv. 4–6).
    Finally, he quits the scene (vv. 7–9).
    When he dies he has to part with all his possessions (vv. 10–11).

II His wrongfully appropriated wealth brings about his downfall (cause of his doom; metaphor of eating).
    His evil deeds change for him from sweetness into poison (vv. 12–14).
    His (wrongfully) appropriated goods cause his doom (vv. 15–17; note v. 16b).
    He has to give up his possessions because he has appropriated them unlawfully (vv. 18–19).

III God Himself causes his inescapable downfall (cause of his doom).
    III.1 His wealth does not give him peace and joy (vv. 20–21).

Without warning God pours out all kinds of misfortunes upon him (vv. 22–23).

III.2 There is no getting away from his troubles (vv. 24–26).
God Himself puts an end to the iniquities and riches of the wicked (vv. 27–29; cf. vv. 22–23).

6.3 Transition markers

6.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

6.3.1.1 *lkn*, v. 2a
h- interr., v. 4a
z’t, v. 4a
’y, v. 7b

6.3.1.2 *‘d*, v. 4a
lnṣḥ, v. 7a
’mr, v. 7b

6.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

6.3.2.1 *’l* (prohib.), v. 17a
zh, v. 29a
rš‘, v. 29a

6.3.2.2 jussive: *yhy*, v. 23a

6.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

rš‘, v. 5a
ḥnp, v. 5b
jussive: *ygl*, v. 28a

6.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

6.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’dm*, vv. 4, 29; *’kl*, vv. 21, 26; *’l* (/ *’lhym*), vv. 15, 29 (*’lhym*), 29; *’m*, vv. 6, 12; *’mr*, vv. 7, 29; *’p*, vv. 23, 28; *’rṣ*, vv. 4, 27
b: *b*-, vv. 2, 2, 12, 13, 14, 14, 17, 20, 20, 22, 23, 23, 26, 28; *bṭn*, vv. 15, 20, 23; *byt*, vv. 19, 28; *bl‘*, vv. 15, 18
d: *dl*, vv. 10, 19
h: *-hw*, vv. 8, 9, 9, 15, 15, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26; *-h* vv. 12, 13 (3×)
w: *-w*, vv. 6, 6, 7 (3×), 9, 10 (3×), 11 (3×), 12, 12 etc.
z: *z’t*/*zh*, vv. 4 and 29 respectively
ḥ: *ḥyl*, vv. 15, 18, 21
y: *-y*, vv. 2, 3; *yd*, vv. 10, 22; *yd‘*, vv. 4, 20
k: *k*-, vv. 7, 8, 8, 18; *ky*, vv. 5, 19, 20; *kl*, vv. 22, 26; *kn*, vv. 2, 21
l: *l*-, vv. 2, 6, 6, 7, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27; *l’*, vv. 8, 9, 9, 13, 18, 18, 19, 20, 20, 21, 26; *lšwn*, vv. 12, 16

m: *ml'*, vv. 11, 22, 23; *mn*, vv. 3, 5, 15, 24, 25, 25, 29, 29; *mny*, vv. 4, 4; *mrwrh*, vv. 14, 25
n: *-ny*, vv. 2, 3
ʿ: *ʿzb*, vv. 13, 19; *ʿl* (/*ʿly*), vv. 4 (*ʿly*), 11, 13, 21, 23, 25
p: *ptn*, vv. 14, 16
q: *qwm*, vv. 9, 27; *qrb*/*qrb*, vv. 5, 14
r: *r'h*, vv. 7, 17; *r'š* ('head')/*r'š* ('poison'), vv. 6 and 16 resp.; *ršʿ*, vv. 5, 29
ś: *śryd*, vv. 21, 26
š: *šwb*, vv. 2, 10, 18; *šmym*, vv. 6, 27

6.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *yšb* hiphʿil/*ʿnh*, vv. 2a and 3b resp.
-ny, vv. 2a.3b!
-y, vv. 2b.3a! } chiasm
vv. 4–6: *mny*/*mn*, vv. 4a+b and 5a resp.
ʿd/*ʿdy*, vv. 4a and 5b resp.—alliteration
vv. 7–9: *k-*, vv. 7a.8a—exactly linear; see also v. 8b
r'h/*ḥzh*/*šzp* ... *šwr*, vv. 7b, 8b and 9 resp.
wl', vv. 8a.9a+b
-hw, vv. 8a.9a+b
vv. 12–14: *b-*, vv. 12a.13b.14a+b
-h, vv. 12b.13a (2×)+b!
yḥml/*lḥmw*, vv. 13a and 14a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
vv. 15–17: *wyq'nw*/*yynq*, vv. 15a and 16a resp. (alliter.)—linear
-hw, vv. 15a+b.16b
'l/*'l*, vv. 15b and 17a resp. (alliter.)—inclusion
vv. 18–19: *wl'*, vv. 18a+b.19b
vv. 20–21: *l'*, vv. 20a+b.21b; see also *l'klw* in v. 21a—alliteration
bbṭnw/*ṭwbw*, vv. 20a and 21b resp.
vv. 22–23: *b-*, vv. 22a.23b+c
ml', vv. 22a.23a
vv. 24–26: *mn*, vv. 24a.25a+b
-hw, vv. 24b.26b—inclusio
vv. 27–29: *glh*/*gll**, vv. 27a and 28a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear

6.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 20–23 (III.1): *bṭnw*, vv. 20a.23a—inclusio
bḥmwdw/*blḥwmw*, vv. 20b and 23c resp.—inclusio

vv. 24–29 (III.2):	*mn*, vv. 24–25.29a+b—inclusio
	b’hlw/m’lhym, vv. 26c and 29a resp. (alliter.)—linear

6.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 4–11 (canto I):	*mny ‘d/lnṣḥ*, vv. 4a and 7a resp.—linear
vv. 12–19 (canto II):	*lšwn*, vv. 12b.16b!
	wl’, vv. 13a.18–19—inclusio
	‘zb, vv. 13a.19a!—inclusio
	ptnym, vv. 14b.16a!
	ḥyl, vv. 15a.18b—linear
	bl‘, vv. 15a.18a!—linear
	-hw, vv. 15–16.19b
vv. 20–29 (canto III):	*l’*, vv. 20–21.26b
	śryd, vv. 21a.26c!—linear
	’kl, vv. 21a.26b!—linear; see also *r‘h* in v. 26c!
	kl, vv. 22b.26a!—‘concatenatio’
	’pw, vv. 23b.28b!—linear; cf. *blḥwmw* in v. 23c

6.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 4–6.27–29, inclusio!:	*z’t/zh*, vv. 4a and 29a resp.!
	’dm, vv. 4b.29a! (Habel)
	’rṣ, vv. 4b.27b! (Habel)
	rš‘, vv. 5a.29a! (Habel)
	šmym, vv. 6a.27a! (Habel)
vv. 2–3.10–11.18–19.27–29:	*šwb* (hiph‘il), vv. 2a.10b.18a!—linear
	bnyw/ybnhw, vv. 10a and 19b resp.!—allit.
	yrṣw/rṣṣ, vv. 10a and 19a resp.!—alliter.
	dlym, vv. 10a.19a!
	byt, vv. 19b.28a!
vv. 4–6.12–14.20–23:	*yd‘*, vv. 4a.20a!—exactly linear
	mqrwb/bqrbw, vv. 5a and 14b resp.!—allit.
	ky, vv. 5a.20a
	’m, vv. 6a.12a!—linear
vv. 7–9.15–17:	*r’h*, vv. 7b.17a!—linear
	tšwrnw/ywršnw, vv. 9b and 15b resp.—allit.

vv. 18–19.20–21: *ky*, vv. 19a.20a—concatenatio

see also *mrwrt* ... *bqrbw/wbrq mmrrtw*, vv. 14b and 25b resp. (alliter.: Fokkelman)

6.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

6.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

b-, *bṭn* (v. 15), *-hw*, *ḥyl* (v. 21), *k-* (v. 18), *l'* (v. 13), *ml'* (v. 11), *mn*

6.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

'l (/'lhym), *'mr*, *-w*, *yd*, *kn*, *l-*, *mrwrh*, *ʻl*, *qwm*, *r'š/r'š*

6.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–3.4–10.11–17.18–23.24–29 (2.7.7.6.6)
Stickel (1842): 2–5.6–9|10–11.12–16.17–18.19–23.24–25.26–29 (4.4|2.5.2.5.2.4)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–5||6–11.12–17|18–23.24–29 (4||6.6|6.6 > 2.2||6×2|6×2)
Ewald (1854): 2–4.5–11.12–18.19–25.26–29 (3.7.7.7.4)
Merx (1871): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23.24–25b.25c–26.27–28|29 (14×2|2)
Hitzig (1874): 2–3 4–5.6–11|12–14.15–18|19–21.22–25|26–28 29 (2 2.6|3.4|3.4|3 1)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–5.6–11.12–16.17–21.22–25.26–28.29 (8.12.10.10.10.7.2)
Wright (1883): 2–5.6–8.9–11|12–14.15–18.19–21|22–23.24–26a.26b–29 (8.6.6|6.8.6|5.6.8)
Dillmann (1891): 2–5 ('Eingang u. Thema').6–11.12–17.18–23.24–28 29 (8.12.12.13.12 2)
Bickell (1894): 2a+4a+5.6–7.8+10.15–16.17–18.19+21.22+23b–c.24–25b.25c–26.27+29
Ley (1895): 2–5.6–11.12–17.18–23.24–28.29 (4.4×6.1); cf. Dillmann (1891)
Duhm (1897): 2–3|4–5.6–7.8+11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20+22.23+25b–26a.26b–27.28–29
Vetter (1897): 2–3|4–5|6–7.8–9|10–11.12–13.14–15.17–18|19–21|22–23.24–26|27–28 29
Hontheim (1904): 2–4+11.6–10|12–16|17–23.24–29 (5.5|5|7.7)
Schlögl (1916): 3+2+4–11.12–21.22–29 (3×20)
Ball (1922): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23a+c.24–25b.26a–b+27.28–29; cf. Merx (1871)

Peters (1928): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–14.15–16.17–18.19–21.22+23b–c.24–25b+26.27–29 (5×2.3.2.2.3.2.3.3 = 28; cf. Job 19)

König (1929): 2–5.6–11.12–17.18–23.24–29; cf. Ley (1895)

Kissane (1939): 2–5+11.6–10.12–16|17–21.22–25b.25c–29 (3×5|3×5; ‘two parts’)

Irwin (1946): 2–3|4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11|12–13.14–15.16–17.18–19|20–21.22–23.24–25. . . ; cf. Ball (1922)

Möller (1955): 2–3.4–11.12–21.22–29 (2.8.10.8)

Skehan (1961): 2–3.4–9.11–16.17–22.23–28.29 (2.4×6.1); similarly MacKenzie (1990)

Fohrer (1963): 2–3|4–7.8–11.12–14+16.15+17–19.20–23.24–26|27–29 (2|6×4|3)

Terrien (1963): 2–3.4–5|6–7.8–9+11|12–14.15–16|17–18.19+10+20|21–22.23–25b|25c–26.27–29

TOB (1978): 2–3|4–29; similarly Hartley (1988)

KBS (1980): 2–3.4–5.6–11.12–18.19–21.22–28.29

De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14+16.15+17.18–19.20–21.22+23b–c.24–25b.25c–26.27–28.29; cf. Irwin (1946)

Van Selms (1982): 2–11.12–19.20–29; similarly Gordis (1978)

Webster (1983): 2–3.4–7.8–11.12–16.17–19.20–22.23–25.26–29

Habel (1985): 2–3.4–11.12–22.23–29; cf. Möller (1955)

Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–3.4–5|6–7.8–9.10–11||12–14.15–16.17–19|20–21.22–23||24–26.27–29

Clines (1989): 2–3||4–7.8–11|12–15.16–19.20–23|24–26.27–29 (2||4.4|4.4.4|4[!].3; ‘the tricolon (v. 23) . . . functions as a device of closure’); cf. Fohrer (1963)

Lescow (1992), pp. 140–42: . . . |12–15|16–17|18–20.21–22| . . . (. . . |8|4|8.2| . . . ; . . . a.b.a’ . . .)

6.6 Comments and summary

According to Clines there are no problems as far as the framework of ch. 20 is concerned. The structure of Zophar’s second speech, he says, is ‘of the simplest’: introduction (vv. 2–3), the doom of the wicked (vv. 4–28), summary appraisal (v. 29). The *strophic* structure is also supposed to be ‘plain’: the poem consists primarily of four-line substrophes (see anal. 6.5). In this respect Clines agrees with Fohrer. We might wonder, however, whether Clines does not make things seem simpler than they are. Anal. 6.5 shows that scholars have also detected a sequence of primarily five-line strophes (Kissane; and cf. Terrien). According to Ley the poem mainly displays six-line strophes (see also Dillmann). Skehan’s framework is also based on a sequence of six-line strophes, but these strophes do not coincide with the six-line strophes of Ley! This information makes it clear that the rhetorical structure of ch. 20 is more complicated than Clines will have it.

Nevertheless, as far as the overall structure of the poem is concerned, Clines rightly observes that the poem opens with an introduction of two lines (vv. 2–3),[1] and that from v. 4 onwards we can discern three main units (according to Clines: vv. 4–11, 12–23 and 24–29).[2] Further, he aptly notes that vv. 4–11 represent a self-contained unit, because it moves to a 'point of closure' with v. 11b; note 'lies down in the dust' (p. 483).[3] The second main unit, according to Clines, is 'marked out by the unity of the image of food' and winds up with v. 23. The analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as a whole, however, indicates that this second unit does not end with v. 23, but with v. 19 (see Irwin, Van Selms and Gordis). Note in the first place the root *yd'* ('to know') in vv. 4 and 20 (see anal. 6.4.5). This root marks the first lines of canto I and III.[4] This interpretation of the root *yd'* as a responsion at the beginning of the first and the third canto, univocally goes along with the *linear* pattern of verbal repetitions that demarcate the end of the cantos; see especially *dlym* ('helpless people'), *šwb* (hiph'il 'to bring back') and *byt* ('house') in anal. 6.4.5. The introductory unit of vv. 2–3 conforms to this pattern of responsions at the end of the cantos; see *šwb* hiph'il in v. 2a. The lines may be taken as the last strophe of an incomplete, preceding canto.[5]

The first canto thematically deals with the ultimate disaster of the wicked; see especially vv. 7–9 and 11b. It is remarkable that we should find this idea immediately and quite explicitly formulated at the beginning of the poem. The theme of the wicked's doom is mostly found at the end of the friends' speeches; see 8,22 11,20 15,30–31.34–35 18,13. The following cantos, then, are especially devoted to the causes of this doom. Canto II seeks the cause of this doom in the evil deeds of the godless people themselves; see especially v. 16a (the pivot line of the central strophe of the canto). The metaphor of eating dominates the canto up to and including v. 18. In the final line of the canto (v. 19) the poet abandons the metaphorical language and plainly notes the crimes of the wicked. This may be taken as a device of closure. From v. 20 onwards we can only speak of allusions to the food image; see v. 21a, 23a, but also v. 26b–c (note the responsio by *'kl*). V. 20 introduces a new theme: the wicked man cannot escape his fate (see v. 20b; cf. Lescow [1992], p. 142). This theme is elaborated in vv. 24–25.[6] Further, we find here the idea that God Himself causes the wicked man's doom; see vv. 23b–c and 28b–29.[7] On the basis of this thematic alternation canto III falls into two canticles: vv. 20–23 and 24–29. This canticle division is supported by a fine pattern of verbal repetitions; note *śryd* ('remnant'), *'kl* ('to eat') and *'pw* ('his anger') in anal. 6.4.4. So, from a thematic as well as from a formal point of view the canticles form a *linear*, external parallelism.

---

[1] Cf. the introductory units of the preceding poems (15,17–19,29). So also Köster, Duhm, Vetter, Irwin, Möller, Skehan, Fohrer, TOB, Hartley, Habel. For the special character of such introductory units see part VI, 1.2.6.

[2] For a comparable tripartite framework see Wright, Schlögl, Irwin, Möller, Van Selms and Habel in anal. 6.5.

[3] It is generally recognized that v. 11 closes a main unit in the poem; see anal. 6.5 and cf. also anal. 7.6 note 8 below.

[4] For *yd'* in the first colon of canto I (20,4a) see also the preceding poem (19,6a).

[5] Habel points to a number of 'key terms' which are repeated 'with subtle variations in meaning' (pp. 313–14). These terms, according to Habel, form 'an intricate web of thematic interrelationships in the design of the poem'. Habel fails to explicitly note, however, the relationships between the key words in question and the framework of ch. 20.

The main body of the poem (vv. 4–29) is obviously demarcated by the device of inclusio; see anal. 6.4.5![8] The cluster of verbal repetitions that constitute this inclusio indicates that v. 29 may not be taken as a concluding line which is relatively separated from the main body of the poem,[9] but belongs with the final strophe of the third canto (cf. 18,21). Note *zh*, *'dm* and *rš'* in v. 29a.

It must be admitted that the strophic structure proper of Zophar's second speech is not very easy to discern. I think, this is due to the fact that the delimitation of the strophes also depends on the pattern of responsions that determines the overall structure of the poem (see anal. 6.4.5). The strophic structure of the second and the third canto is supported by some linear verbal repetitions that mark the beginning (in canto II) and the end (in canto III) of the strophes; see *ḥyl* ('wealth'), *bl'* ('to swallow'), *śryd* ('remnant') and *'kl* ('to eat') in anal. 6.4.4. See for vv. 22–23 also *ml'* ('to fill') in anal. 6.4.2. So, canticle III.1 falls into two identical strophes of two lines and canticle III.2 into two identical strophes of three lines. The first and the final strophe of the main body of the poem (vv. 4–6 and 27–29 resp.) are marked as a close unit by the cluster of verbal repetitions that makes up the inclusio (see anal. 6.4.5). We must assume, then, that the transition between vv. 6 and 7 is characterized by enjambement. The clause of v. 6 carries on through vv. 7–9, which lines form the apodosis. The correspondence between *mny ʿd* ('from of old') and *lnṣḥ* ('forever') in the first lines of the strophes concerned (anal. 6.4.4) sustains this view. See also *'y* ('where?') in v. 7b (anal. 6.3.1.1); further *'l* prohib. in v. 17a (anal. 6.3.2.1). So I conclude that the first and the second canto display an identical strophic pattern: 3.3.2. The strophic framework of the third canto, 2.2|3.3, somehow reflects this pattern.

---

[6] Cf. Clines's characterization of his third main unit: 'the inescapable end of the wicked'.

[7] Cf. Möller about vv. 22–29: 'Gott wird ihn durch Krieg ängsten und verderben' (p. 51) and Van Selms on vv. 20–29: 'Gods oordeel treft hem onvermijdelijk' ('God's judgment inevitably strikes him').

[8] So also Habel. Cf. the inclusions that mark the main body of the poems in chs. 18 and 19.

[9] See Merx, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Ley, Vetter, Skehan, KBS in anal. 6.5 and cf. Clines.

On the basis of this rhetorical analysis, we have to look for the *main theme* of the poem, I think, in vv. 4–6 and 27–29. These strophes represent the first and the final subunits of the main body of the composition and are clearly marked out by the device of inclusio. They formulate the thought that *the wicked man's prosperity is of short duration because God puts an end to it.* Zophar for the first time explicitly states that the destruction of the wicked is caused by God Himself. With this idea he flies in the face of Job's opinion in ch. 19, that God will be on his side. Note also the root *klm* ('to humiliate') in the introductory units of the successive speeches (19,3 and 20,3) and the root *ydʿ* in the first line of cantos I (19,6 and 20,4).

The first canto of Zophar's speech (vv. 4–11), furthermore, displays several verbal correspondences with the final canto of ch. 19 (vv. 20–29); see *r'h* in 20,7 and 19,27, *ḥzh* in 20,8 and 19,26–27, *ʿyn* in 20,9 and 19,27, *qwm* in 20,9 and 19,25, *ʿṣm* in 20,11 and 19,20, *ʿl ʿpr* in 20,11 and 19,25. The cluster of these correspondences is no coincidence. In this way Zophar seems to make it clear that Job's confidence about his vindication in due course might prove fatal to him.[10]

---

[10] The relationship between chs. 19 and 20 furthermore comes to light by the fact that the poems display the same number of lines and cola; cf. part VI, 1.2.7. For an overview of 'satirical allusions' in Zophar's second speech to earlier statements by Job in general see J.C. Holbert, '"The skies will uncover his ininquity": satire in the second speech of Zophar (Job 20)', *VT* 31 (1981), pp. 171–79 (cf. Habel, pp. 314–15).

7 Job’s second reply to Zophar: Job 21

Structure: 3 11.11.7 1 > 3 3.3.3.2|3.3.3.2|2.2.3 1

A [2] *šm‘w šmw‘ mlty* *wthy z’t TNḤWMTYKM*
[3] *ś’wny w’nky ’dbr* *W’ḤR dbry tl‘yg*
[4] *h’nky l’DM śyḥy* *w’m* **mdw‘** *l’ tqṣr rwḥy*

I [5] *PNW ’ly whšmw* *wśymw YD ‘l ph*
[6] *w’m zkrty wnbhlty* *w’ḥz bśry plṣwt*
[7] **mdw‘** *RŠ‘YM yḥyw* *‘tqw gm gbrw ḥyl*

[8] *zr‘m nkwn* **lpny**_hm ‘mm_ *wṣ’ṣ’yhm l‘YNYhm*
[9] *BTYhm šlwm mpḥd* *wl’ šbṭ ’LWH ‘lyhm*
[10] *šwrw ‘br wl’ yg‘l* *tplṭ prtw wl’ tškl*

[11] *yšlḥw kṣ’n ‘wylyhm* *wyldyhm yrqdwn*
[12] *yś’w btp wknwr* *wyśmḥw lqwl ‘wgb*
[13] *yblw bṭwb YMYhm* *wbrg‘ š’wl yḥtw*

[14] *Wy’mrw l’l swr mmnw* *wd‘t DRKYk l’ ḥpṣnw*
[15] *mh šdy ky n‘bdnw* *wmh nw‘yl ky npg‘ bw*

II [16] *HN l’ bYDm ṭwbm* *‘ṣt RŠ‘YM rḥqh mny*
[17] *kmh nr RŠ‘YM yd‘k* *wyb’ ‘lymw ’YDm* *ḥblym yḥlq b’pw*
[18] *yhyw ktbn lPNY rwḥ* *wkmṣ gnbtw swph*

[19] *’LWH yṣpn lbnyw ’wnw* *yšlm ’lyw* **wyd‘**
[20] *yr’w ‘YNw kydw* *wmḥmt šdy yšth*
[21] *ky mh ḥpṣw bBYTw ’ḥryw* *wmspr ḥdšyw ḥṣṣw*

[22] *hl’l ylmd* **d‘t** *WHW’ rmym yšpwṭ*
[23] **zh ymwt b**_‘ṣm tmw_ *KLw šl’nn wšlyw*
[24] *‘ṭynyw ml’w ḥlb* *wmḥ ‘ṣmwtyw yšqh*

[25] **Wzh ymwt b**_npš mrh_ *wl’ ’kl bṭwbh*
[26] *yḥd ‘l ‘pr yškbw* *wrmh tksh ‘lyhm*

III [27] *HN yd‘ty mḥšbwtyKM* *wmzmwt ‘ly tḥmsw*
[28] *ky t’mrw ’yh BYT ndyb* *w’yh ’hl mšknwt RŠ‘YM*

[29] *hl’ š’ltm ‘wbry DRK*   *w’ttm l’ tnkrw*
[30] *ky lYWM ’YD yḥśk r‘*   *lYWM ‘brwt ywblw*

[31] *my ygyd ‘l pnyw DRKw*   *WHW’ ‘śh my yšlm lw*
[32] *WHW’ lqbrwt ywbl*   *w‘l gdyš yšqwd*
[33] *mtqw lw rgby nḥl*   *W’ḤRYw KL ’DM ymšwk*   *wlpnyw ’yn mspr*

B [34] *w’yk TNḤMWny hbl*   *wtšwbtyKM nš’r m‘l*

7.1 Text

V. 12a—*btp*: ‘with a timbrel’; see BHS (so Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Hölscher, Van Selms, Hartley). MT *ktp* (‘like a timbrel’).

V. 13a—*yblw*: ‘they wear out, spend’ (so K); Q and the old versions *yklw* (‘they complete, finish’; cf. Job 36,11). Both readings are acceptable (Gordis); cf. anal. 7.4.4.

V. 16: because v. 16a is unbecoming for Job and v. 16b also occurs in the following speech by Eliphaz (22,18b) the first colon is variously emended or the whole line is taken as a gloss (so Hölscher, Fohrer, Pope, De Wilde, Rozelaar, MacKenzie, Lescow). However, MT makes good sense; see anal. 7.6.

V. 19a—*’lwh*: Ley (1895), p. 664 suggested to read the negative *’l* in stead of *’lwh* (‘God’); so also Duhm, Steuernagel, BHK. Van Selms reads *’lw* (‘if’); cf. Eccles. 6,6 and Esther 7,14. Anal. 7.4.4, however, supports MT’s originality.

7.2 Content

The prosperity of the wicked is connected with God’s irrational administration.

A Introduction: please, listen attentively to my words (vv. 2–4; direct personal address to the friends).
I Portrayal of the prosperity and happiness of the godless.
    Theme: my problem is, that the *wicked* always prosper (vv. 5–7).
    They have success all round (vv. 8–10).
    Their children dance about and they themselves descend in peace into the underworld (vv. 11–13).
    This is so, notwithstanding the fact that they do not care for God at all (vv. 14–15).

II God’s irrational behaviour: the wicked man is not always overtaken by disaster (refutation of the friends’ assertions).

The *wicked* are not systematically punished (vv. 17–18); introduced by a quotation of the friends about the fragility of the wicked man’s fortune (v. 16).

Their ultimate doom has no significance, because they do not care about their houses after they have died (v. 21); introduced by a quotation of the friends about the wicked man’s punishment (vv. 19–20).

It is exactly because of God’s irrational behaviour that ultimately everybody indiscriminately lies down in the underworld (v. 26), some people without experience of misery (vv. 23–24; cf. v. 13) and others after a lifetime full of adversity (v. 25); introduced by a quotation of the friends about God’s just administration (v. 22).

III The friends’ false reasoning: the wicked (mostly) remain free from disaster.

Theme: I know your objections to my expositions about the fate of the *wicked* (vv. 27–28; direct personal address to the friends; cf. vv. 5 and 2–4).

Any traveller will tell you that the evildoer is spared calamities (vv. 29–30).

Nobody dares to denounce him during his lifetime (v. 31), and he is buried with honour besides (vv. 32–33; cf. v. 23–24).

B Conclusion: your speeches are neither comforting nor conclusive (direct personal address to the friends; cf. vv. 27–28).

7.3 Transition markers

7.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

7.3.1.1 imperative: *šmʿw*, v. 2a;
ext. // imperat. *ś’wny* in v. 3a
paronom. inf. constr.: *šmʿw šmwʿ*, v. 2a
jussive: *thy*, v. 2b
z’t, v. 2b
imperative: *pnw*, v. 5a
imperative: *hšmw*, v. 5a
imperative: *śymw*, v. 5b
w- beginning line, v. 14a
imperative: *swr*, v. 14a
hn, v. 16a
h- interr, v. 22a
hw’, v. 22b
w- beginning line, v. 25a
hn, v. 27a
h- interr., v. 29a
my, v. 31a
hw’, v. 31b; ext. // *hw’* in

v. 32a
my, v. 31b
w- beginning line, v. 34a
’yk, v. 34a

7.3.1.2 *rš‘*, v. 16b; ext. // *rš‘* in v. 17a

7.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

7.3.2.1 *’nky*, v. 4a; ext. // *’nky* in v. 3a
rš‘, v. 7a
gm, v. 7b
’mr, v. 28a
rš‘, v. 28b

7.3.2.2 *h*- interr., v. 4a
mdw‘, v. 4b
mdw‘, v. 7a
mh, v. 15a
mh, v. 15b
mh, v. 21a

7.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

w- beginning line, v. 6a
’mr, v. 14a
kmh, v. 17a
zh, v. 23a

zh, v. 25a
’yh, v. 28a
’yh, v. 28b
w- beginning line, v. 32a

7.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

7.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’dm*, vv. 4, 33; *’ḥr*, vv. 3, 21, 33; *’yd*, vv. 17, 30; *’yh*, vv. 28, 28; *’l* (prep.), vv. 5, 19; *’l* (‘God’), vv. 14, 22; *’lwh*, vv. 9, 19; *’m*, vv. 4, 6; *’mr*, vv. 14, 28; *’nky*, vv. 3, 4
b: *b*-, vv. 12*, 13, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 25; *byt*, vv. 9, 21, 28
d: *dbr*, vv. 3, 3; *drk*, vv. 14, 29, 31
h: *h*- interr., vv. 4, 22, 29; -*hw*, vv. 15, 18; *hw’*, vv. 22, 31, 32; *hyh*, vv. 2, 18; -*hm*, vv. 8 (3×), 9, 9, 11, 11, 13, 26; *hn*, vv. 16, 27
w: -*w*, vv. 10, 10, 15, 17, 19 (3×), 20, 20, 21 (4×), 23, 23, 24, 24, 31 (3×), 33 (3×)
z: *zh*, vv. 23, 25 (see also *z’t* in v. 2)
ḥ: *ḥpṣ*, vv. 14, 21
ṭ: *ṭwb*, vv. 13, 16, 25
y: -*y*, vv. 2, 3, 4, 4, 5, 6, 27; *ybl*, vv. 30, 32 (see also *blh* in v. 13*); *yd*, vv. 5, 16; *yd‘*, vv. 14, 19, 22, 27; *ywm*, vv. 13, 30, 30
k: *k*-, vv. 11, 17, 18, 18; *ky*, vv. 15, 15, 21, 28, 30; *kl*, vv. 23, 33 (see also *klh* in v. 13*); -*km*, vv. 2, 27, 34
l: *l*-, vv. 4, 8, 8, 12, 14, 18, 19, 22, 30, 30, 31, 32, 33, 33; *l’*, vv. 4, 9, 10, 10, 14, 16, 25, 29, 29

m: *-m*, vv. 8, 8, 16, 16, 17, 29; *mdw‘*, vv. 4, 7; *mh*, vv. 15, 15, 17, 21; *mwt*, vv. 23, 25; *my*, vv. 31, 31; *mn*, vv. 9, 14, 16, 20
n: *nḥm*, vv. 2, 34; *-ny*, vv. 3, 16, 34; *nś’*, vv. 3, 12
s: *spr*, vv. 21, 33
‘: *‘br*, vv. 10, 29, 30 (II); *‘yn*, vv. 8, 20; *‘l*, vv. 5, 9, 17, 26, 26, 27, 31, 32; *‘ṣm*, vv. 23, 24
p: *pnh*, vv. 5, 8, 18, 31, 33
r: *rwḥ*, vv. 4, 18; *rš‘*, vv. 7, 16, 17, 28
š: *šdy*, vv. 15, 20; *šlm*, vv. 19, 31 (see also *šlwm* in v. 9 and *šlyw* [from *šlh*] in v. 23); *šm‘*, v. 2, 2

7.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–4: *mlh*/*dbr*, vv. 2a and 3a+b resp.
-y, vv. 2a.3b.4a+b
’nky, vv. 3a.4a!
vv. 5–7: *-y*, vv. 5a.6b
šmm niph‘al*/*bhl* niph‘al, vv. 5a and 6a resp.—linear
vv. 8–10: *-hm*, vv. 8a+b (2×).9b
l‘ynyhm/*‘lyhm*, vv. 8b and 9b resp.—alliteration (rime)
wl’, vv. 9b.10a+b
vv. 11–13: *yšlḥw*/*wyśmḥw*, vv. 11a and 12b resp.—alliter.
-hm, vv. 11a+b.13a—inclusio
btp/*bṭwb*, vv. 12a and 13a resp. (‘alliter.’)—linear; see also *b-* in v. 13b
vv. 14–15: *’l* (‘God’)/*šdy*, vv. 14a and 15a resp.
vv. 16–18: *-m*, vv. 16a (2×).17b
k-,vv. 17a.18a+b
vv. 19–21: *’lwh*/*šdy*, vv. 19a and 20b resp.
’wn/*kyd*, vv. 19a and 20a resp.—linear
-w, vv. 19a (2×)+b.20a (2×).21a (3×)+b
vv. 22–24: *‘ṣm*, vv. 23a.24b!
-w, vv. 23a+b.24a+b
vv. 25–26: *mrh*/*wrmh*, vv. 25a and 26b resp.—alliteration
vv. 27–28: *mḥšbwtykm*/*mšknwt*, vv. 27a and 28b resp.—alliteration
vv. 29–30: *‘br*, vv. 29a.30b
vv. 31–33: *‘l*, vv. 31a.32b
pnym, vv. 31a.33c—inclusio
-w, vv. 31a (2×)+b.33a+b+c—inclusio; note *pnyw* in vv. 31a.33c and *lw* in vv. 31b.33a

l-, vv. 31b.32a.33a+c
whw', vv. 31b.32a

7.4.3 Within the cantos

vv. 5–15 (canto I): *pnh*, vv. 5a.8a—linear
bhl/pḥd, vv. 6a and 9a resp.—exactly linear; cf. Job 22,10b 23,15
zr'm ... wṣ'ṣ'yhm/'wylyhm wyldyhm, vv. 8 and 11 resp.—linear

vv. 16–26 (canto II): *ṭwb*, vv. 16a.25b—linear
'yd ... ḥblym/'wn ... kyd, vv. 17b–c and 19a+20a resp.
'pw/ḥmt šdy, vv. 17c and 20b resp.—linear
l-, vv. 18a.19a—concatenatio
yd', vv. 19b.22a—linear
zh ymwt b-, vv. 23a.25a!

vv. 27–33 (canto III): *ky*, vv. 28a.30a—exactly linear
ndyb/r', vv. 28a and 30a resp.!—exactly linear; see also *rš'* in v. 28b
drk, vv. 29a.31a—exactly linear
l-, vv. 30a+b.31–33—concatenatio
ybl, vv. 30b.32a!

7.4.4 Within the composition as a whole

vv. 2-4.34, inclusio: *tnḥwmty-/tnḥmw*, vv. 2b and 34a resp.!
-km, vv. 2b.34b
-ny, vv. 3a.34a

vv. 2–4.5–10.16–21.31–33: *-y*, vv. 2–4.5a+6b.27b!
hyh, vv. 2b.18a!
'ḥr, vv. 3b.21a.33b; note *w'ḥr* in vv. 3b and 33b
'dm, vv. 4a.33b! (linear)
-ny, vv. 3a.16b
w'm, vv. 4b.6a!
mdw', vv. 4b.7a! (linear)
rwḥ, vv. 4b.18a! (linear)
pnh, vv. 5a+8a.18a.31a+33c!

vv. 5–10.16–21.27–30.34:	*pnh*, vv. 5a+8a.18a
	’ly/ ’lyw, vv. 5a and 19b resp.!
	-y, vv. 5a+6b.27b
	yd, vv. 5b.16a!—linear
	wnbhlty/hbl, vv. 6a and 34a resp. (alliter.)—linear
	rš‘ym, vv. 7a.16b+17a.28b!—linear; see also *ndyb* and *r‘* in vv. 28a and 30a resp. (cf. Lescow, p. 145)
	yḥyw/yhyh, vv. 7a and 18a resp.—linear
	zr‘m . . . wṣ’ṣ’yhm/lbnyw, vv. 8 and 19a resp.—linear
	-m, vv. 8a (2×).16a (2×)+17b.29b!
	‘ynym, vv. 8b.20a!—linear
	byt, vv. 9a.21a.28a!; see also *’hl mšknwt* in v. 28b!
	šlwm/yšlm, vv. 9a and 19b resp. (alliter.)—linear
	’lwh, vv. 9b.19a!—linear; see also *šdy* in v. 20b
	‘br, vv. 10a.29a+30b!—linear
	hn, vv. 16a.27a!—exactly linear
	’yd, vv. 17b.30a!; see also *pḥd* and *šbṭ ’lwh* in v. 9, *ḥblym* in v. 17c, *’wn* in v. 19a, *kyd* in v. 20a
	’p . . . ḥmh/ ‘brh, vv. 17c+20b and 30b resp.; cf. Ps. 7,7
	mḥšbwty-/ wtšwbty-, vv. 27a and 34b resp.! (alliter.)—linear
	-km, vv. 27a.34b—linear
	’yh/ ’yk, vv. 28a+b and 34a resp.!—linear
vv. 11–15.22–26.29–33:	*yblw/ywblw . . . ywbl*, vv. 13a* and 30b+32a resp.—alliteration
	bṭwb(h), vv. 13a.25b
	ywm, vv. 13a.30a+b!—linear
	w- beginning strophe, vv. 14a.25a—exactly linear
	l’l, vv. 14a.22a!; see also *šdy* in v. 15a
	drk, vv. 14b.29a+31a!
	hw’, vv. 22b.31b+32a!

kl, vv. 23b.33b!; cf. also *yklw* in v. 13a* and *’kl* in v. 25b—alliteration

see also: *yd‘*—first line of the strophe, vv. 14b.19b.22a.27a!
ky—last line of the strophe, vv. 15a+b.21a.28a.30a!
-hw—last line of the strophe, vv. 15a.18b!
yšlm ’lyw/lw—first line of the strophe, vv. 19b.31b!
mspr—last line of the strophe, vv. 21b.33c!

vv. 14–15.16–18: *-hw*, vv. 15a.18b!—concatenatio
b-, vv. 15b.16a+17c—concatenatio

7.4.5 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

7.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration
b- (v. 21), *-hm* (v. 26), *-w*, *k-* (v. 11), *l-*, *l’*, *‘l* (note *‘lyhm* in vv. 9b and 26b)

7.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*’yh*), *’mr*, *h-* interr., *ḥpṣ*, *mh*, (*my*), *mn*, *nś’*, (*šdy*), (*šm‘*)

7.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–3.4–7.8–11.12–15|16–18.19–21.22|23–26.27–30.31–34 (2.3×4|3.3.1|3×4)
Stickel (1842): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–15|16–18.19–21|22|23–26.27–30.31–34 (4×3|2|3.3|1|3×4)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–4 5–7.8–10.11–13.14–15|16–18.19–21.22–24.25–26|27–28.29–31.32–34 (3 11.11.8 > 3 3×3.2|3×3.2|2.3.3)
Ewald (1854): 2–5|6–10.11–15.16.17–21.22–26|27–30.31–34 (4|5.5.1.5.5|4.4)
Merx (1871): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8+11.10+9.12–13.14–15.16–17a.17b–19a.19b–20*.21–22.23–24.25–26.27–28.29–30.31–32.33*|34 (17×4|2)
Hitzig (1874): 2–6|7–13.14–15|16–18.19–21.22–26|27–28.29–33|34 (5|7.2|3.3.5|2.5|1)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–6.7–11.12–16.17–21.22–26.27–31.32–33.34 (3×10.11.10.10.5.2)
Wright (1883): 2–4.5–8.9–12.13–16.17–18|19–22.23–26.27–30.31–33.34 (6.8.8.8.5|8.8.8.7.2)
Dillmann (1891): 2–6|7–11.12–16.17–21.22–26|27–30.31–34 (10|10.10.11.10|8.9); cf. Delitzsch (1876)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.4–5.6–7.9–10.8+11.12–13.14+16.17b+a+18.19–20.14,21–22.21,22+24.25–26.27+34

Ley (1895): 2–6.7–11.12–16.17–21.22–26.27–31.32–34 (6×5.3); cf. Dillmann (1891)

Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5|6–7.9–10.8+11.12–13.14–15.16–17b.17c–18.19–20. 21–22.23–24.25–26.27–28.29–30.31–32.33–34

Vetter (1897): 2–3|4–6|7–8.9–10.11–12.13–15|16a+x.17–18|19–21|22.23–24. 25–26|27–28.29–31.32–33|34

Hontheim (1904): 2–7|8–13||14–18||19–22.23–26|27+34+28–29.30–33 (6.6|5|8.8)

Schlögl (1916): 2–12.13–22+34.23–33 (3×22)

Ball (1922): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.17a–b+18.19–20.21–22. 23–24.25–26.27–28.29–30.31–32.33–34

Peters (1928): 2–3.4–6|7–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–18|19–21.22–24.25–26. 27–28.29–31.32–33.34 (2.3|3.2.2.2.3|3.3.2.2.3.2.1)

König (1929): 2–6.7–15.16–21.22–26.27–34

Kissane (1939): 2–6.7–12|30–31+13–15.16–21.22–26.27–29+32–34 (5.6|5.6.5.6)

Möller (1955): 2–3.4.5–15.16.17–21.22.23–33.34 (2.1.11.1.5.1.11.1)

Skehan (1961): 2–6.7–12.13–17.18–20.21+23–26.27–29.30–34 (5.6.5.3.5.3.5)

Fohrer (1963): 2–5|6–9.10–13|14–15+17–18.19–22.23–26|27–30.31–33b+34 (8×4)

Terrien (1963): 2–3.4–6|7–9.10–13|14–15.16–18|19–21.22+x|23–26.27–28| 29–31.32–34

Weiser (1968): 2–6.7–16.17–21.22–26.27–34; cf. Epping-Nelis (1968)

TOB (1978): 2–6|7–13.14–18|19–26.27–29.30–33.34; cf. Peters (1928)

KBS (1980): 2–6.7–16.17–26.27–34

De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.6–7.9–10.8+11.12–13.14–15|17–18.19–20.21–22. 23–24.25–26|27–28.29–30.31–32a+33b.33a+32b+34 (2–6.7–18.19–22. 23–26.27–33.34; p. 226)

Van Selms (1982): 2–6.7–15.16–26.27–34

Webster (1983): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–15.16–18.19–21.22–26.27–29.30–33 (34)

Habel (1985): 2–6.7–16.17–26.27–33.34

Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–3.4–6||7–10.11–13.14–16|17–18.19–22.23–26|| 27–28.29–32.33–34

Hartley (1988): 2–6|7–16.17–21.22–26.27–34 (2–6.7–33.34); cf. König (1929)

MacKenzie (1990): 2–6.7–9.10–13.14–15+17–18|19–21.23–26|27–29.30–34 ('5.3.4.4|3.4|3.5'; strophic division uncertain)

Lescow (1992), pp. 142–45: 2–3.4–5||6–7|8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15|17a–b+18|| . . . (4.4||4|4×4|4||. . . ; a|b.c.b'|. . .)

7.6 Comments and summary

Analysis 7.5 makes it clear that there is no scholarly consensus about the exact structure of Job's second reply to Zophar in ch. 21. Generally speaking critics agree that the poem opens with an introductory unit and that main disjunctions can be observed before or after v. 16 and between vv. 26 and 27. Some critics also recognize a main break between vv. 21 and 22.[1] There is no unanimity, however, about the exact demarcation of the introduction. Most consider vv. 2–6 as a close unit;[2] according to others the introduction ends with v. 5.[3] Schlottmann just takes vv. 2–4 as the introduction proper; cf. Möller in anal. 7.5. The exact demarcation of the main units, cantos, in ch. 21 can only be defined, I think, on the basis of an analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as a whole. This rhetorical analysis confirms the framework Schlottmann almost 150 years ago (more or less intuitively) drew up for this poem on the several levels of the cantos and the strophes. This formal approach furthermore helps to explain the position and function of v. 16 in the poem.

The analysis of the transition markers and a comparison with other poems that open with an introductory unit (see chs. 10 and 15–20) makes it clear that the introduction of ch. 21 is confined to vv. 2–4. Note especially *'nky* ('I') and *mdw'* ('why?') in v. 4 (see anal. 7.3.2.1), and the imperatives in v. 5 (see anal. 7.3.1.1). The call to listen in vv. 2–3 and the subjective reflection on Job's actual situation (v. 4; note *śyḥy*) characterize vv. 2–4 as the introduction to this poem.[4] For v. 5 as the beginning of the first canto see below, about the formal relationship between vv. 2–4 and the beginning of cantos I and II.

The most obvious cluster of responsions, now, we find at the beginning of the cantos; note especially *pnh* ('to turn'), *yd* ('hand'), *rš'ym* ('wicked'), *hn* ('behold') in anal. 7.4.4. These responsions in the first place indicate that v. 16 represents the opening line of canto II; see *hn*, *yd* and *rš'ym*.[5] Anal. 7.4.4 further shows that this pattern of linear, verbal repetitions does not confine to the beginning of the cantos but continues to the end of these units. See especially *ʿynym* ('eyes'), *byt* ('house'), *ʾlwh* ('God'), *ʿbr* ('to cross'; 'to show oneself infuriated'), *ywm* ('day'), *w-* at the beginning of a strophe, *lʾl* ('to God'), *drk* ('way'), *ʾyd* ('disaster'), *hwʾ* ('he'), *kl* ('all').

---

[1] So Vetter, König, Weiser, Epping-Nelis, Hartley.

[2] So Dillmann, Peters, König, Weiser, NEB, TOB, KBS, NJPS, Van Selms, Habel, Hartley, a.o.

[3] So Ewald, Duhm, Fohrer, NEB, Gordis.

[4] About the special character of the introductory units see part VI, 1.2.6.

[5] Cf. Köster, Vetter, König, Van Selms in anal. 7.5; see also Budde and NEB. Recently, v. 16 has frequently been taken as the end of the first main part; so RSV, Andersen, KBS, Habel, Hartley. For v. 27 as the beginning of a main unit see Schlottmann, Ewald, Dillmann, Vetter, Hontheim, König, Fohrer, Weiser, KBS, De Wilde, Van Selms, Habel, Hartley, Mackenzie in anal. 7.5.

This formal demarcation of the cantos is corroborated by an observation of the progression of ideas in the main units; cf. anal. 7.2. The first canto (vv. 5–15) explicitly deals with the prosperity and happiness of the wicked. After some introductory clauses in vv. 5–6, v. 7 formulates the theme of the canto: the wicked always prosper. The line can be identified as a thematic clause by the noun *ršʿym* ('wicked'). In v. 16 we also come across this noun. At the beginning of a new main part it is not necessary that the line thematically ties in with vv. 14–15. In the context of the overall structure of the poem Schlottmann (with reference to Schnurrer[6]), Hitzig, Budde, NBG, Tur-Sinai, and Webster (p. 49) provide the most obvious explanation, I think. The whole line has to be taken as a quotation by Job of the friends' position: 'behold, their prosperity is not in their hand // the counsel of the wicked is far from me' (cf., e.g., 20,10b and see 22,18). True, the line is not marked as such by a quotation formula. The responsions between the beginning of cantos II and III, however, lend force to the theory that Job is citing his friends here; note the quotation formula *ky tʾmrw* in v. 28a. This interpretation is surely to be preferred to emendation of v. 16a or elimination of the whole line.[7] The second canto differs from the preceding main unit because, now, Job explicitly refutes his friends about the supposed doom of the wicked. Quotation of the reasoning of his partners in dialogue appears to be a hallmark of this second canto (see below). In the third canto (vv. 27–33) Job not only departs from his own experiences but also refers to those of other people, wayfarers (vv. 29–30). This final canto winds up with an elaboration on the honourable end of the wicked (vv. 32–33). The unit opens with an explicit quotation by Job of the friends' words (v. 28). This line constitutes the theme of the final canto and is characterized as a thematic introduction by the noun *rš'ym* (v. 28b).

---

[6] C.F. Schnurrer, *Animadversiones ad quaedam loca Iobi*, Tübingen, 1781.

[7] It is remarkable that Gordis cannot accept this interpretation (see also his 'Special Note 17', pp. 529–30). This scholar argues that v. 16a is not in place after the long description of the fortunes of the godless people. V. 16a taken as the friends' words produces 'two series of quotations' (cf. vv. 14–15). Therefore Gordis emends the colon and reads: 'Indeed, our prosperity is not in His hands!' (*hn lʾ bydw ṭwbnw*). This reasoning, however, does not take into account the rhetorical structure of the poem. It may be noted, though, that the transition between cantos I and II is characterized by thematic connection. V. 16 is an immediate refutation by the friends of Job's observation about the way of life of the wicked in vv. 14–15. This is suggested by a strophe in the following poem, 22,17–18, which from a semantic point of view is very similar to 21,14–16. The close unit of 22,17–18 is broken up into vv. 17 and 18 and spread over two different cantos, 21,14–15 and 21,16 respectively. Cf. part II, 6.6 note 10 about Ps. 103,15–16 and Job 7,7–10, and the phenomenon of the break-up of stereotype phrases on the level of the line; see Watson (1984), pp. 328–32.

It is striking that each of the three cantos *should open* with a reference to personal feelings; note vv. 5–6, 16b and 27. In vv. 5–6 it regards the feelings of the friends and Job as to the prosperity of the evildoers. In v. 16b it regards the feelings of the friends only about the godless behaviour of the wicked. V. 27 deals with the mutual feelings of Job and his friends. This also applies to the final line of the poem, v. 34. From this thematic perspective the line links up with the linear pattern of ideas and can be seen as the first line of an incomplete canto at the end of the poem; see also the suffix *-km* in vv. 27 and 34 (anal. 7.4.4). In the first parts of the cantos we also come across the idea that the wicked are safe from calamity and disaster; see vv. 9, 17–18, 30 (cf. also v. 20). The first parts of cantos I and II, finally, also deal with the prosperity and disaster of the children of the wicked; see vv. 8 and 19. Each of the three cantos *ends* with a reference to the death of the wicked; note vv. 13, 23 and 32–33.[8] Cantos I and III furthermore wind up with a reference to the crimes of the wicked; see vv. 14–15 and 31. So, the cantos univocally display a *linear*, external parallelism. This rhetorical pattern comes to light on the basis of a formal, as well as of a thematic analysis. The first and the second cantos display an identical length of eleven lines. From this point of view the third canto stands apart with only seven lines.

The introductory unit has, first, a formal relationship with the *beginning* of cantos I and II; see especially *hyh* ('to be'), *w'm*, *mdw'* ('why?'), and *rwḥ* ('wind') in anal. 7.4.4. The strophe is a direct personal address to the friends (note vv. 2–3). From this perspective the opening line of canto I ties in with the introduction; note the imperatives plural in v. 5 and especially *pnw 'ly* ('turn to me') in v. 5a. This phenomenon is to be explained as concatenatio; cf. the transitions between 19,5 and 6, and 20,3 and 4. V. 5 distinguishes itself from the formal call to listen in the introductory unit by the imperative *hšmw* ('be appalled') and v. 5b ('put your hand to your mouth'). These expressions already relate to the theme proper of the first canto. Job does not entreat his friends to be appalled and astonished about *his desperate situation* (as the line is commonly understood), but about the *prosperous situation of the wicked* (cf. v. 7).[9] The verbal correspondences between vv. 2–4 and the end of canto III (vv. 31–33; see anal. 7.4.4) match the *linear* pattern of correspondences on the level of the cantos. Vv. 2–4, namely, can be taken as the final strophe of an incomplete canto; cf. above, about v. 34.

---

[8] For the theme of death as a device of closure see Barbara Herrnstein-Smith, 'Poetic Closure. A Study in How Poems End', Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 101–02 and 175–78.

[9] So Schlottmann. The call *pnw 'ly* ('turn to me'; v. 5a) does not mean 'look at me', but is also semantically parallel with the call to listen in v. 2a; cf. 6,28.

Taking the framework of the speech on the level of the cantos for granted, the strophic structure of ch. 21 is rather easy to discern. The poem is primarily dominated by strophes of three lines.[10] Note for the first canto anal. 7.2, and *pnh* ('to turn') and the reference to the 'children' in anal. 7.4.3. The beginning of the final strophe (vv. 14–15) is clearly marked by *w-* at the beginning of v. 14; see analyses 7.3.1.1 and 7.4.4! The strophic structure of the second canto is especially determined by unmarked quotations of the friends' words at the beginning of the strophes.[11] Schlottmann, Hitzig (and Schnurrer; cf. above) have already noted that the phenomenon of quotation plays a part from v. 16 onwards.[12] Recently, in the context of his strophic analysis Webster has again pointed to this interpretation. 'In a series of four strophes [vv. 16–18, 19–21, 22–26, 27–29], each would open with Job citing an opinion of the friends which he then refutes' (p. 49).[13] This approach provides the correct explanation, I think, of the obscure lines we meet in the second canto. For v. 16 as a quotation of the friends' statements see above. The second strophe of the canto (vv. 19–21), in my opinion, opens with a quotation of *two lines* (vv. 19–20). Critics mostly take v. 19a only as a quotation of the friends' position.[14] This view poses a problem because there is no single indication in v. 19b of a change of speaker. And the suffering of the wicked man's children, according to the speeches by the friends, is rather an additional element in their punishment (cf. Driver-Gray, I, p. 186). For v. 22 as a quotation see Hitzig, Kroeze,[15] Gordis, Webster and Rozelaar; cf. 11,7–9 15,7–8, but note especially 22,13.[16] The line is commonly understood as a reproach to the friends (cf. Isa. 40,14), sometimes with reference to 13,7–10 (Dhorme, Habel). Driver, however, has correctly noted that 'the friends accept their reading of the facts of life without question' (I, p. 188). Furthermore, in 13,7–8 Job actually reproaches his friends for defending God, not deserting Him.[17] The beginnings of Job's refutations in these strophes are indicated by typical transition markers, which usually indicate the beginning (or the end) of a strophe; note *kmh* in v. 17a, *mh* in v. 21a and *zh* in v. 23a. For the strophic structure of canto II see further *h-* interr. in v. 22a, *hw'* in v. 22b, *w-* beginning line in v. 25a (anal. 7.3.1.1). The progression of ideas already reveals the strophic structure of canto III (anal. 7.2). Note also the linear verbal repetitions in anal. 7.4.3. So, the first and the second canto show an identical strophic structure: 3.3.3.2. The strophic pattern of the third canto, 2.2.3, somehow reflects this structure; cf. the strophic structure of the cantos in ch. 20.[18]

---

[10] Some critics have attempted to demonstrate an uninterrupted sequence of identical strophes here. According to Ley these strophes are supposed to primarily encompass five lines (cf. Dillmann and Delitzsch); according to Fohrer four lines (cf. Köster). The overall structure of the poem resists such rigid strophic interpretations.

[11] For the 'non-necessity of explicitly marking' direct discourse in biblical poetry see S.A. Meier, *Speaking of Speaking. Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* (SupplVT 46), Leiden: Brill, 1992, pp. 32–42. Cf. further A.S. van der Woude, 'Micah in Dispute with the Pseudo-Prophets', *VT* 19 (1969), pp. 244–60; idem, 'Micah IV 1–5: An Instance of the Pseudo-Prophets Quoting Isaiah', in M.A. Beek, A.A. Kampman a.o. (eds.), *Symbolae biblicae et mesopotamicae F.M.Th. de Liagre Böhl dedicatae*, Leiden: Brill, 1973, pp. 396–402; G.V. Smith, 'Job 4,18–21: is it Eliphaz's vision?', *VT* 40 (1990), pp. 457–59; W.G.E. Watson, 'Abrupt Speech in Ugaritic Narrative Verse', *UF* 22 (1990), pp. 415–20.

[12] The special character of v. 16 as 'angeführte Meinung der Gegner', according to Schlottmann, is supported by the parallelism with the beginning of v. 19 (p. 347).

[13] Möller notes in this context that it cannot be established with certainty whether vv. 16 and 22 belong with what precedes or 'als Zitat der Meinung der Freunde, ähnlich wie V. 19a, die Einleitung zum Folgenden bieten' (p. 52).

[14] So Schlottmann, Hitzig, Dillmann, Budde, Driver-Gray, NBG, RSV, Kroeze, Epping-Nelis, NEB, Andersen, Gordis, Webster, Rozelaar, Habel, Hartley; cf. Dhorme, Hölscher, Fohrer, Pope.

The rhetorical structure of the poem indicates that its *quintessential thought* is to be found in the first strophes of the cantos, vv. 5–7, 16–18, 27–28. These strophes contain the thematic lines of the cantos. The *nodal verse* of the poem we find just at the beginning of the first canto, v. 7: *why do the wicked prosper?* The poem represents Job's most explicit refutation of the speeches by the friends up till now.

For the relationship between chs. 21 and 20 see the following verbal correspondences: *z't* in 21,2 and 20,4, *'dm* in 21,4.33 and 20,4.29, *yd* in 21,5.16 and 20,10.22, *rš'* in 21,7.16.17.28 and 20,5.29, *ḥyl* in 21,7 and 20,15.18.21, *byt* in 21,9.21.28 and 20,19.28, *bnym* in 21,10 and 20,10, *śmḥ* in 21,12 and 20,5, *'pw* in 21,17 and 20,23.28, *šlyw* in 21,23 and 20,20, *ml'w* ...

---

[15] With reference to L.H.K. Bleeker, *Job* (Tekst en Uitleg), Groningen, 1935 and Szczygiel.

[16] It is remarkable that the statements Job puts in the mouth of his friends should most explicitly be found in the *following* poem. Cf. in this connection also 21,16 with 22,18.

[17] The quotation theory, according to Driver-Gray, breaks down because in what follows Job makes no reply to the charge. It is concluded then that 'in its present context the v. seems to defy explanation' (I, p. 188). Pope takes the line as a gloss; according to Skehan, NAB and MacKenzie the line belongs to the following speech. Gordis rightly notes, however, that 'Job offers an oblique response in vv. 23–26 by calling upon men to observe the injustice of life' (p. 231).

[18] For the strophic structure of this chapter see, apart from Schlottmann, also Stickel; and for vv. 14–28 Peters (in anal. 7.5).

‘ṣmwtyw/ ‘ṣmwtyw ml’w in 21,24 and 20,11 resp., *‘l ‘pr yškbw/ ‘l ‘pr tškb* in 21,26 and 20,11 resp. (final line of the cantos), *lywm ‘brwt/bywm ’pw* in 21,30 and 20,28 resp., *nḥl* in 21,33 and 20,17, *šwb* in 21,34 and 20,2.10.18. The semantic and formal correspondence between *yšybw* (‘they answer’, 20,2) and *tšwbt* (‘answers’, 21,34) constitutes an inclusio around the second ‘dialogue’ between Zophar and Job. The fact that this ‘ring’ is due to the verb ‘to answer’ is certainly not by chance. The ‘discussion’ between Job and his partners in dialogue tends to end in a circular argument which none is able to break through.

8 Eliphaz’s third speech: Job 22

Structure: 10.9.10 > 2.2.2.2.2||1.2.2.2.2||3.2|3.2

I	[2] *HL’L YSKN gbr*	*KY YSKN* **‘ly***mw mśkyl*
	[3] *Hḥpṣ lšdy KY tṣdq*	*w’m bṣ‘ KY ttm drkyk*
	[4] *Hmyr’tk ykyḥk*	*YBW’ ‘mk bMŠPṬ*
	[5] *H***l’** *r‘tk rbh*	*w’yn qṣ l‘wntyk*
	[6] *KY tḥbl ’ḥyk ḥnm*	*wbgdy ‘rwmym tpšyṭ*
	[7] **l’ mym** *‘yp tšqh*	*wmr‘b tmn‘ lḥm*
	[8] *w’yš zrw‘ lw h’rṣ*	*wNŚW’ PNYM yšb bh*
	[9] *’lmnwt šlḥt ryqm*	*wzr‘wt ytmym ydk’*
	[10] **‘l** *kn sbybwtyk pḥym*	*wybhlk pḥd pt’m*
	[11] *’w ḥšk* **l’** *TR’H*	*wšp‘t* **mym** *tksk*

II	[12] *HL’ ’LWH gbh* **šmym**	*w***r’h** *r’š kwkbym KY rmw*
	[13] *w***’mrt mh** *yd‘* **’l**	*Hb‘d ‘rpl YŠPWṬ*
	[14] *‘bym str lw* **wl’ yr’h**	*wḥwg* **šmym** *ythlk*
	[15] *H’rḥ ‘wlm tšmr*	*’šr drkw mty ’wn*
	[16] *’šr qmṭw* **wl’** *‘t*	*nhr ywṣq yswdm*
	[17] *h***’mrym** *l***’l** *swr mmnw*	**wmh** *yp‘l šdy* **lmw**
	[18] *whw’ ml’ btyhm ṭwb*	*w‘ṣt rš‘ym rḥqh mny*
	[19] *YR’W ṣdyqym wyśmḥw*	*wNQY yl‘g* **lmw**
	[20] *’m* **l’** *nkḥd QYMnw*	*wytrm ’klh ’š*

III.1	[21] *HSKN n’ ‘mw w***šlm**	*bhm TBW’Tk ṭwbh*
	[22] *qḥ n’ mpyw twrh*	*wśym ’mryw blbbk*
	[23] *’m tšwb ‘d* ŠDY *tbnh*	*trḥyq ‘wlh m’hlk*
	[24] *wšyt ‘l ‘pr bṣr*	*wbṣwr nḥlym ’wpyr*
	[25] *whyh* ŠDY *bṣryk*	*wksp tw‘pwt lk*

III.2 [26] KY *’z ‘l šdy tt‘ng*   *wTŚ’ ’l ’lwh PNYk*
[27] *t‘tyr ’lyw wyšm‘k*   *wndryk* **tšlm**
[28] *wtgzr ’wmr wYQM lk*   *w‘l drkyk ngh ’wr*

[29] KY *hšpylw wt’mr gwh*   *wšḥ ‘ynym ywš‘*
[30] *ymlṭ ’y NQY*   *wnmlṭ bbr kpyk*

8.1 Text

V. 2b—*‘lymw*: = *‘lyw*; see GKC § 103 f3, n. 3.

Vv. 17–18: because these verses are supposed to disturb the connection between vv. 16 and 19 and are very similar to 21,14–16, some critics take them as a gloss (so Budde, Driver-Gray, Steuernagel, Hölscher, Fohrer, De Wilde). According to Skehan, Pope, NAB (and MacKenzie) this is only the case with v. 18. The relevant lines, however, perfectly fit the *linear*, formal structure of canto II; see anal. 8.4.4.

V. 17b—*lmw*: ‘to us’; see M. Dahood, *Biblica* 46 (1965), p. 324 and anal. 8.4.4.

V. 20a—*qymnw*: ‘our adversaries’; so MT. Most modern scholars prefer to read *yqmm* (‘their wealth’), with reference to Gen. 7,4.23 Deut. 11,6.

V. 21a—*wšlm*: the principle distinctive of the verse-line has to be placed here; see BHS. Cf. also W.B. Bishai, *JNES* 20 (1961), pp. 258–59.

V. 30a—*’y*: probably an indefinite pronoun (cf. Prov. 31,4); see N.M. Sarna, *JNES* 15 (1956), pp. 118–19. NBG, Gordis, NJPS, Habel and Hartley take this word as a negative particle (cf. 1 Sam. 4,21); so also C. Texton, *ET* 78 (1967), pp. 342–43.

V. 30b—*kpyk*: ‘your hands’; so MT (Dhorme, NBG, RSV, Texton, Gordis, Habel, Hartley). Hölscher, Fohrer, De Wilde, Van Selms read *kpyw* (‘his hands’; cf. Vulg. and Pesh.). The overall structure of the poem, however, supports MT; see anal. 8.4.4–5.

8.2 Content

Eliphaz urges Job to admit his crimes and to submit to God.

I Charges: Job’s crimes.
Can God gain anything by your innocence? (vv. 2–3).
God does not punish you for your piety (vv. 4–5).
You have robbed your needy fellow man (vv. 6–7).
You had the strong man rule over the weak (vv. 8–9).
Therefore, a terrifying darkness is around you at the moment (vv. 10–11).

II Warning: God does not dwell too far away to punish the godless.
God observes everything from his heavenly abode (v. 12); whereas you say that He cannot judge through the dark clouds (vv. 13–14).
You do not use evildoers, who were untimely cut off, as a model, do you? (vv. 15–16).
They do not care about God and yet they are endowed with prosperity (vv. 17–18).
The righteous are rejoiced at the ultimate fate of those people (vv. 19–20).
III Counsel: after repentance there will be salvation by God.
III.1 Call to repentance.
Please, accept instruction from God (vv. 21–23).
Then, there will be a treasure for you in heaven (vv. 24–25).
III.2 The salvation which God provides.
There will be again joy and light (cf. vv. 10–11) on the path of your life (vv. 26–28).
You will be able to intercede for others (vv. 29–30).

8.3 Transition markers

8.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

8.3.1.1 *h-* interr., v. 2a; ext. // *h-* interr. in v. 3a
h- interr., v. 4a; ext. // *h-* interr. in v. 5a
w- beginning line, v. 8a
h- interr., v. 12a
imperative: *r’h*, v. 12b
w- beginning line, v. 13a
mh, v. 13a
h- interr., v. 13b
h- interr., v. 15a
mh, v. 17b
imperative: *hskn*, v. 21a; ext. // *qḥ* and *śym* in v. 22
n’, v. 21a; ext. // *n’* in v. 22a
imperative: *šlm*, v. 21a
w- beginn. line, v. 24a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in v. 25a
imperative: *šyt*, v. 24a
’z, v. 26a

8.3.1.2 no remarks

8.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

8.3.2.1 *rš‘*, v. 18b

8.3.2.2 *w-* beginning line, v. 28a

8.3.3 Contrary indications

’mr, v. 13a
‘wlm, v. 15a
’mr, v. 17a
w- beginning line, v. 18a
hw’, v. 18a
’mr, v. 29a

8.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

8.4.1 General survey

’: *’l* (prep.), vv. 26, 27; *’l* (‘God’), vv. 2, 13, 17; *’lwh*, vv. 12, 26; *’m*, vv. 3, 20, 23; *’mr*, vv. 13, 17, 22, 28, 29; *’šr*, vv. 15, 16
b: *b-*, vv. 4, 8, 21, 22, 24, 30; *bw’*, vv. 4, 21; *bṣr*, vv. 24, 25
d: *drk*, vv. 3, 15, 28
h: *h-* (article), vv. 8, 17; *h-* interr., vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 15; *-hm*, vv. 18, 21
w: *-w*, vv. 8, 14, 21, 22, 22, 27
z: *zrw‘*, vv. 8, 9
ṭ: *ṭwb*, vv. 18, 21
k: *-k*, vv. 3, 4 (3×), 5, 5, 6, 10, 10, 11, 22, 23, 25, 25, 26, 27, 27, 28, 28, 30; *ky*, vv. 2, 3, 3, 6, 12, 26, 29
l: *l-*, vv. 2, 3, 5, 8, 14, 17, 17, 19, 25, 28; *l’*, vv. 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 20
m: *-m*, vv. 16, 20; *mh*, vv. 13, 17; *-mw*, vv. 2, 17, 19; *mym*, vv. 7, 11; *mlṭ*, vv. 30, 30; *mn*, vv. 4, 7, 17, 18, 22, 23
n: *n’*, vv. 21, 22; *-nw*, vv. 17, 20; *nś’*, vv. 8, 26; *nqy*, vv. 19, 30
s: *skn*, vv. 2, 2, 21
‘: *‘l*, vv. 2, 10, 24, 26, 28; *‘m*, vv. 4, 21
p: *pnh*, vv. 8, 26
ṣ: *ṣdq*, vv. 3, 19
q: *qwm*, vv. 20, 28
r: *r’h*, vv. 11, 12, 14, 19; *rḥq*, vv. 18, 23
š: *šdy*, vv. 3, 17, 23, 25, 26; *šlm*, vv. 21, 27; *šmym*, vv. 12, 14; *špṭ*, vv. 4, 13

8.4.2 Within the strophes

vv. 2–3: *h-* interr., vv. 2a.3a—exactly linear
l’l/lšdy, vv. 2a and 3a resp.
ky, vv. 2b.3a+b
vv. 4–5: *h-* interr., vv. 4a.5a—exactly linear
yr’tk/r‘tk, vv. 4a and 5a resp.!—linear

vv. 8–9: *zrw‘*, vv. 8a.9b! (Hontheim)
vv. 10–11: -*k*, vv. 10a+b.11b
vv. 13–14: *‘rpl/‘bym*, vv. 13b and 14a resp.
vv. 15–16: *’šr*, vv. 15b.16a!
vv. 17–18: *mn*, vv. 17a.18b
vv. 19–20: *wnqy/qymnw*, vv. 19b and 20a resp.—alliteration
mw/-m, vv. 19b and 20b resp.
vv. 21–23: *n’*, vv. 21a.22a!—linear (Hontheim)
-*w*, vv. 21a.22a+b
b-, vv. 21b.22b
mn, vv. 22a.23b
-*k*, vv. 22b.23b—exactly linear (rhyme)
vv. 24–25: *w*- at the beginning of the line, vv. 24a.25a—exactly linear
bṣr, vv. 24a.25a!—linear (Hontheim)
wbṣwr/bṣryk, vv. 24b and 25a resp.—alliteration
vv. 26–28: *‘l*, vv. 26a.28b—inclusio
’l (prep.), vv. 26b.27a!
-*k*, vv. 26b.27a+b.28a+b
wndryk/drkyk, vv. 27b and 28b resp.—alliteration

8.4.3 Within the canticles

vv. 21–23.24–25 (III.1): *b*-, vv. 21b+22b.24b—linear
šdy, vv. 23a.25a—linear
m’hlk/lk, vv. 23b and 25b resp.—rhyme (alliter.)
vv. 26–28.29–30 (III.2): *ky*, vv. 26a.29a—exactly linear
pnyk/kpyk, vv. 26b and 30b resp. (rhyme)—inclusio
’mr, vv. 28a.29a—concatenatio
wyqm/nqy, vv. 28a and 30a resp. (alliter.)—linear

8.4.4 Within the cantos

vv. 2–11 (canto I): *h*- interr. ext. // *h*- interr. (exactly linear), vv. 2–3.4–5
ky, vv. 2–3.6a
‘l, vv. 2b.10a—linear
ttm/tmn‘/ytmym/wšp‘t mym, vv. 3b, 7b, 9b and 11b resp. (alliteration)—linear
-*k*, vv. 2–11

b-, vv. 4b.8b—linear
bmšpt/*tpšyt*, vv. 4b and 6b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
l', vv. 5a.7a.11a—linear
mym, vv. 7a.11b!—linear

vv. 12–20 (canto II): *h*- interr., vv. 12a.13b—concatenatio
l', vv. 12a.14a.16a.20a—linear; note *wl'* in vv. 14a and 16a
'lwh/*'l*, vv. 12a.13a—concatenatio
šmym, vv. 12a.14b!—linear }
r'h, vv. 12b.14a—linear; but cf. also v. 19a chiasm (Bezuidenhout, p. 247 n. 1)
'mr, vv. 13a.17a—exactly linear
mh, vv. 13a.17b!—linear
'l ('God'), vv. 13a.17a—linear; see also *šdy* in v. 17b
h- interr., vv. 13b.15a—linear
h'rḥ/*h'mrym*, vv. 15a and 17a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
-*m*, vv. 16b.20b!—linear
-*nw*, vv. 17a.20a!
lmw, vv. 17b.19b!—exactly linear; see also *l*- in v. 17a
whw' ml'/*'m l'*, vv. 18a and 20a resp. (alliter.)—linear

vv. 21–30 (canto III): -*w*, vv. 21–22.27a—linear
šlm, vv. 21a.27b!—linear
-*k*, vv. 21–30
'l, vv. 24a.26a+28b—'concatenatio'
šdy, vv. 25a.26a—concatenatio (Hontheim); see also *'lwh* in v. 26b
-*k*, vv. 25b.30b—exactly linear ('rhyme')

8.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–7.12–16.21–25: *h*- interr., vv. 2–5.12a+13b+15a!; see also *hskn* in v. 21a
hl'l . . . gbr/*hl' 'lwh gbh*, vv. 2a and 12a resp. (alliteration)—exactly linear

skn, vv. 2a+b.21a!—exactly linear
ky, vv. 2–3+6a.12b
bṣ‘/bṣr, vv. 3b and 24–25 resp.!—alliter. (Habel)
bw’, vv. 4b.21b!
‘m (prep.), vv. 4b.21a!
špṭ, vv. 4b.13b!—exactly linear
b‘d/‘d, vv. 13b and 23a resp.—alliteration

vv. 8–11.17–20.26–30: *h-* (article), vv. 8a.17a!—linear
nś’ + *pnym*, vv. 8b.26b!—exactly linear
ḥšk/’wr, vv. 11a and 28b resp.! (Bezuidenhout, p. 249)
-k, vv. 11b.30b—exactly linear (rhyme)
ṣdq/br, vv. 19a and 30b resp.—linear
nqy, vv. 19b.30a!—linear
qwm, vv. 20a.28a!

vv. 2–3.29–30, inclusio: *ṣdq/br*, vv. 3a and 30b resp.; cf. also *drkyk* in vv. 3b and 28b

vv. 10–11.12, concat.: *l’*, vv. 11a.12a
r’h, vv. 11a.12b

vv. 17–20.21–25, ‘concat.’: *-hm*, vv. 18a.21b!
ṭwb, vv. 18a.21b!
rḥq, vv. 18b.23b!

8.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

8.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
’mr (v. 22), *b-* (v. 30), *drk*, *-w*, *l-*, *-mw* (v. 2), *mn*

8.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
’m, (*mlṭ*,) *ṣdq*

8.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–5.6–9.10–11|12–15.16–20|21–25.26–30 (4.4.2|4.5|5.5)
Stickel (1842): 2–5.6–9.10–11|12–14.15–18.19–20|21–25.26–30 (4.4.2|3.4.2|5.5)

Schlottmann (1851): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11||12–14.15–17.18–20||21.22–23.24–25|26.27–28.29–30 (5×2||3.3.3||1.2.2|1.2.2); similarly Peters (1928)
Ewald (1854): 2–5.6–9.10–11|12–20|21–25.26–30
Merx (1871): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9|10–11.12–14.15–17.19–20|21–22.23–25.26–27.28–30 (4×4|4.6.6.4|4.6.4.6)
Hitzig (1874): 2–4.5–9.10–11|12–14.15–20|21–25.26–30 (3.5.2|3.6|5.5)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–5.6–9.10–11.12–14.15–18.19–20.21–25.26–30 (8.8.4.6.8.4.10.10)
Wright (1883): 2–4.5–7.8–10|11–14.15–18.19–20|21–22.23–26.27–30 (6.6.6|8.8.4|4.8.8)
Dillmann (1891): 2–5.6–10|11–14.15–20|21–25.26–30 (8.10|8.12|10.10) or 2–5.6–9|10–14.15–19|21–25.26–30 (8.8|10.10|10.10)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12+17.18–19.21–22.23+26.27–28
Ley (1895): 2–5.6–10.11–15.16–20.21–25.26–30 (4.5×5)
Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5|6–7.8–9.10–11.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23+26.27–28.29–30; cf. Hölscher (1952)
Vetter (1897): 2–4|5–7.8–9|10–11|12–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22|23–25.26–27.28–30
Hontheim (1904): 2–4+10–11.5–9|12–20|21–25.26–30 (5.5|9|5.5)
Schlögl (1916): 2–11.12–16+21–25.26–30 (20.20.10)
König (1929): 2–11.12–20.21–30; similarly RSV (1952), KBS (1980), Van Selms (1983), Hartley (1988)
Kissane (1939): 2–5*.6–7+9–11.12–14+8+18|15–17+19–20|21–25.26–30 (6×5)
Irwin (1946): 2–3|4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11|13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24.25–26.27–28 (2|4×2|4×2|4×2)
Möller (1955): 2–11.12–20.21–30 (10.9.10)
Skehan (1961): 2+21,22+22,3–5.6–7+9–11.12–14.15–17+19–20.21–25.26–30 (5.5.3.5.5.5); cf. NAB (1970)
Fohrer (1963): 2–5.6–9.10–11+13–14.15–16+19–20|21–23+26.27–30 (6×4); cf. Kissane (1939)
Terrien (1963): 2–3.4–5|6–8.9–10|11–12.13–14|15–16.17–20|21–22.23–25|26–28.29–30
TOB (1978): 2–4|5–11|12–14.15–20|21–30
Webster (1983): 2–5.6–9.10–14.15–20.21–25.26–30
Habel (1985): 2.3–4.5.6–9.10–11|12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–25.26–29.30
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–5.6–9.10–11|12–14.15–18.19–20|21–23.24–28.29–30 (4.4.2|3.4.2|3.5.2)
MacKenzie (1990): 2–5|6–11|21,22+22,12–14.15–20|21–25.26–30 (4.5|4.5|5.5)

8.6 Comments and summary

Eliphaz's third speech represents one of the few poems in the book of Job of which the overall structure is hardly controversial. Critics generally agree that the poem displays three main sections: vv. 2–11, 12–20, 21–30.[1] Not always, however, scholars offer a satisfactory thematic description of the units concerned. Problems especially arise as to the determination of the specific thought of vv. 12–20. A sound description of that, though, we find in the commentary by Schlottmann: 'Eliphas beschuldigt den Hiob geradezu einzelner grober Vergehen' (vv. 2–11); 'Er warnt ihn, durch Trotz gegen Gott sich nicht ein ähnliches Gericht, wie die Frevler der Vorwelt zuzuziehen' (vv. 12–20); 'Er verheißt ihm im Fall der Aussöhnung mit Gott die Erneuerung und Steigerung seines ehemaligen Glücks' (vv. 21–30); cf. anal. 8.2.[2]

Apart from a thematic component, these main units (cantos) also show a formal aspect, a clear pattern of verbal repetitions; see especially *h*-interr., *skn* ('to be of use'), *bw'* ('to come'), *'m* ('with'), *špṭ* ('to judge'), root *nś'* + *pnym* ('to lift up one's face'), *ḥšk*/*'wr* ('darkness'/'light'), *nqy* ('innocent'), *qwm* ('to stand') in anal. 8.4.5. This formal pattern obviously supports the canto division of ch. 22, described above on the grounds of the development of the content. On the basis of these verbal repetitions a *linear*, external parallelism can be observed between the three successive cantos. The beginnings of the cantos (vv. 2–7, 12–16, 21–25) correspond with each other, as do the ends of the cantos (vv. 8–11, 17–20, 26–30). This formal pattern has a thematic component, too (cf. also Bezuidenhout, p. 245). The first and the second canto open with a saying 'about El as a transcendent deity' (Habel), vv. 2–3 and 12. The following lines of these cantos deal with God's *judgment*, vv. 4–5 and 13–14. Then, from vv. 6 and 15 onwards the lines refer to Job's gross *sin* and the *sin*ful behaviour of evil men (cf. Habel). In canto III we also find an allusion to this theme; see *'wlh* ('iniquity') in v. 23b. The cantos wind up with an allusion to the *doom* of the wicked (vv. 10–11 and 20; see also v. 16) and to the *rescue from this doom* (vv. 26–30).[3] The cantos exhibit an almost identical number of lines, about ten lines. Because in the middle canto the total number of lines is just nine, the poem displays a concentric framework, an a.b.a' pattern, seen from this point of view.[4]

---

[1] So Köster, Stickel, Schlottmann, Hitzig, Peters, König, Möller, RSV, Andersen, KBS, Van Selms, Habel, Bezuidenhout, Hartley; cf. Hontheim, Budde, Irwin, TOB, MacKenzie. Anal. 8.5 makes it clear that there is some doubt as to the correct position of the first main break. Merx puts this break between vv. 9 and 10 (cf. Dillmann), Wright between vv. 10 and 11 (cf. Dillmann and Terrien).

[2] Cf. also Weiser: 'Die Beschuldigung' (vv. 4–11); 'Die Warnung' (vv. 12–20); 'Die Mahnung und Verheissung' (vv. 21–30).

[3] Note the comparable device at the end of the cantos in the preceding poem, ch. 21. Habel also points to the linear parallelism between cantos I and II (pp. 334–35), but

The final canto falls into two identical canticles. For this division see especially *ky* in anal. 8.4.3, *šlm* ('to keep peace'/'to pay vow') in anal. 8.4.4. Canticle III.1 (vv. 21–25) is dominated by the call to repentance (note vv. 21–22.24), while canticle III.2 (vv. 26–30) is entirely devoted to an elaboration of the theme of Job's happy future (cf. vv. 21, 23, 25).[5]

The framework of the poem on the level of the cantos and the canticles taken for granted, the strophic structure of these sections, broadly speaking, is rather easy to discern. The two-line strophe dominates the main part of this poem. See for cantos I and II analyes 8.2, 8.4.2 and the *linear*, verbal repetitions in anal. 8.4.3.[6] Vv. 17–18 constitute a semantic chiasm: repudiation (vv. 17a.18b), blessing by God (vv. 17b.18a); Bezuidenhout, p. 248 n. 2. See also *w-* beginning line in vv. 8, 13, 24 (anal. 8.3.1.1). Together with the imperative *šyt* this formal device plays an important part in determining the strophic structure of canticle III.1, which on thematic grounds can hardly be established.[7]

The rhetorical analysis of the poem indicates that its *main thought* is to be found at the end of the cantos, especially at the end of canto III (vv. 26–30). Eliphaz in the first place tries to explain to Job his suffering (vv. 10–11); next, he attempts to make clear that Job is among the evil men who are cut off (vv. 19–20; note v. 20a). Eliphaz finally contrasts this suffering with a *description of salvation* (vv. 26–30). This salvation will not only fall to Job himself, but will also reflect on other people (against Kroeze). With his direct accusations of Job as a wicked person in cantos I–II Eliphaz immediately responds to Job's explicit refutation of the friends' theory in the preceding poem.[8]

---

fails to see that the third canto also harmonizes with this pattern.

[4] So also Köster, Stickel, Schlottmann, Hontheim, Peters, Möller (see anal. 8.5).

[5] So also Köster, Stickel, Schlottmann, Ewald, Hitzig, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Ley, Hontheim, Peters, Kissane, Skehan, Terrien, Webster, MacKenzie.

[6] About v. 12 as a mono-line strophe see also part VI, 1.2.5.

[7] For the strophic structure of canto I see also Schlottmann, Merx, Bickell, Duhm, Peters, Irwin Hölscher (and De Wilde); for canto II Duhm, Vetter, Irwin, Hölscher, Habel (p. 334; and De Wilde); cf. for the strophic structure of canto III Schlottmann. Advocates of strophic structures frequently attempt to impose the 'canticle division' of canto III upon the poem as a whole. See the five-line units in the divisions by Ley, Hontheim, Kissane, Skehan, NAB and MacKenzie. At the expense of vv. 12, 17–18, 24–25, Fohrer assumes a rigid framework with strophes of four lines.

[8] See for the allusions between 22,13.17–18 and ch. 21 analysis 7.6 above.

9 Job’s third reply to Eliphaz: Job 23

Structure: 1 5.5.5 > 1 2.3|2.3|2.3

A	[2]	*gm hywm mry śḥy*	*ydy kbdh ‘l ’nḥty*

I	[3]	*MY ytn* **yd‘ty** *w’mṣ’HW*	*’bw’ ‘d tkwntw*
	[4]	*’‘rkh lpnyw* **mšpṭ**	*wpy ’ml’* **twkḥwt**
	[5]	*’D‘H mlym y‘nny*	*w’BYNH mh Y’MR ly*
	[6]	*hbrb kḥ yryb ‘MDY*	*l’ ’k hw’ yśm by*
	[7]	*šm yšr* **nwkḥ** *‘mw*	*w’plṭh lnṣḥ* **mšpṭy**

II	[8]	*hn qdm ’hlk w’ynNW*	*w’ḥwr* **wl’ ’byn** *lw*
	[9]	*śm’wl b‘ŚTw* **wl’** *’ḥz*	*y‘ṭp ymyn* **wl’** *’r’h*
	[10]	*ky YD‘ drk ‘MDY*	*bḥnny kzhb ’ṣ’*
	[11]	*b’šrw ’ḥzh rgly*	*drkw šmrty* **wl’** *’ṭ*
	[12]	*mṣwt śptyw* **wl’** *’myš*	*mḥqy ṣpnty ’MRY pyw*

III	[13]	*whw’ b’ḥd wMY yšybNW*	*wnpšw ’wth wY‘Ś*
	[14]	**ky** *yšlym ḥqy*	*wkhnh rbwt ‘mw*
	[15]	*‘l kn mpnyw ’bhl*	*’TBWNN w’pḥd mm***nw**
	[16]	*w’l hrk lby*	*wšdy hbhylny*
	[17]	**ky** *l’ nṣmty mpny ḥšk*	*wmpny ksh ’pl*

9.1 Text

V. 2b—*ydy*: the final *y* is perhaps an alternative suffix 3 masc. sg. (Blommerde, p. 99; cf. LXX and Pesh.).

V. 6b—*yśm*: ellipsis for *yśm lb* (‘he pays heed’); cf. 4,20—so Gordis and Habel (otherwise Hartley).

V. 7b—*w’plṭh*: I read this form as a qal (‘I would be free’); MT vocalizes as a pi‘el.

V. 7b—*mšpṭy*: ‘from my judge’; so MT (Gordis and Hartley). Most scholars follow LXX and Vulg. and read ‘my judgment’. In my opinion, the vocalization of MT retains the original purpose of the poet; see *mn* in anal. 9.4.4.

Vv. 8–9: some critics are of opinion that these verses disturb the connection between vv. 7 and 10; they take them as a gloss to v. 3 (so Budde, Driver-

Gray, Steuernagel, Hölscher, Fohrer, De Wilde, Lescow). According to Bickel this is only the case with v. 9. Deletion of these lines, however, would disturb the thematic and formal framework of the poem as a whole; see anal. 9.2 and 9.4.4 (cf. Gordis, p. 261).

V. 12b—*mḥqy*: lit. ‘beyond my statute’; so MT (Habel, Rozelaar; cf. also NJPS). Many scholars follow LXX and Vulg. and read *bḥqy* (‘in my bosom’). The reading of MT is supported by the rhetorical function of *mn* on the level of the poem as a whole; see anal. 9.4.4.

V. 17a—*ky l’*: ‘indeed’ (*l’* has emphatic force); so Gordis and Hartley (cf. Habel).

V. 17b—*wmpny*: ‘and before my face’; so MT.

9.2 Content

Job is not able to find God to defend his innocence.

A My complaint remains bitter (v. 2; about Job).

I Job cannot find God to expound to Him his righteousness.

If only I could find God to bring my case before Him (vv. 3–4; about God’s untraceability).

I would surely be found upright, then (vv. 5–7; about Job’s innocence).

II God is aware of Job’s innocence.

God, however, does not let himself be found by me (vv. 8–9; about God’s untraceability).

He surely knows that I am innocent (vv. 10–12; about Job’s innocence).

III God’s arbitrariness.

What God intends to do He also accomplishes (vv. 13–14; about God’s arbitrariness).

That is the very reason why I stand in dread of Him (vv. 15–17; about Job’s anxiety).

9.3 Transition markers

9.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

9.3.1.1 *my ytn*, v. 3a
cohortative.: *’d‘h*, v. 5a
cohortative: *’bynh*, v. 5b
mh, v. 5b
hn, v. 8a
w- beginning line, v. 13a
hw’, v. 13a
my, v. 13a

9.3.1.2 *gm*, v. 2a
’mr, v. 5b

9.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

9.3.2.1 *lnṣḥ*, v. 7b

9.3.2.2 no remarks

9.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

cohortative: *’‘rkh*, v. 4a
h- interr., v. 6a
’k, v. 6b
hw’, v. 6b
w- beginning line, v. 16a

9.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

9.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’ḥz*, vv. 9, 11; *’mr*, vv. 5, 12
b: *b-*, vv. 6, 6, 9, 11; *bhl*, vv. 15, 16; *byn*, vv. 5, 8, 15
d: *drk*, vv. 10, 11
h: *-hw*, vv. 3, 8, 13, 15; *hw’*, vv. 6, 13
w: *-w*, vv. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 11, 12, 12, 13, 14, 15
ḥ: *ḥq*, vv. 12, 14
y: *-y*, vv. 2 (3×), 4, 5, 6, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17; *yd‘*, vv. 3, 5, 10; *ykḥ*, vv. 4, 7
k: *k-*, vv. 10, 14; *ky*, vv. 10, 14, 17
l: *l-*, vv. 4, 5, 7, 8; *l’*, vv. 6, 8, 9, 9, 11, 12, 17
m: *my*, vv. 3, 13; *mn*, vv. 7, 12, 15, 15, 17, 17
n: *-ny*, vv. 5, 10, 16
‘: *‘l*, vv. 2, 15; *‘m*, vv. 7, 14; *‘md-*, vv. 6, 10; *‘śh*, vv. 9, 13
p: *ph*, vv. 4, 12; *pnym*, vv. 4, 15, 17, 17
r: *rbb*, vv. 6, 14
š: *špṭ*, vv. 4, 7

9.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 3–4: *tkwntw*/*twkḥwt*, vv. 3b and 4b resp. (allit.)—linear
-w, vv. 3b.4a
vv. 5–7: *-y*, vv. 5b.6b.7b—rhyme; see also *-y* in v. 6a and *-ny* in v. 5a —rhyme
‘md-/*‘m*, vv. 6a and 7a resp.—linear

vv. 8–9: *wl'*, vv. 8b.9a+b
vv. 10–12: *drk*, vv. 10a.11b!
-*y*, vv. 10a.11a—rhyme; see also -*y* in v. 12b and -*ny* in v. 10b
wl', vv. 11b.12a
vv. 15–17: *mpny*, vv. 15a.17a+b—inclusio; see also *mn* in v. 15b
bhl, vv. 15a.16b!
-*y*, vv. 16a.17b; see also -*ny* in v. 16b

9.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 3–7 (canto I): *my/mh*, vv. 3a and 5b respectively—linear }
yd', vv. 3a.5a—linear; see also *byn* in v. 5b }
chiasm
mšpṭ/mšpṭ, vv. 4a and 7b resp.!—linear } chiasm
ykḥ, vv. 4b.7a!—linear

vv. 8–12 (canto II): *wl'*, vv. 8–9.11–12!—inclusio
byn/yd', vv. 8b and 10a respectively—linear
'ḥz/'ḥzh, vv. 9a and 11a resp.—alliteration

vv. 13–17 (canto III): -*hw*, vv. 13a.15b—linear
ky, vv. 14a.17a—exactly linear
-*y*, vv. 14a.16a+17b

9.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

The linear arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 2.5–7.10–12.15–17: *mry/'mry*, vv. 2a and 12b resp. (alliter.)—linear
'l, vv. 2b.15a!
yd', vv. 5a.10a—linear
-*ny*, vv. 5a.10b.16b!
byn, vv. 5b.15b—linear
'mr, vv. 5b.12b!; see also *mlym* in v. 5a!
'mdy, vv. 6a.10a!
mn, vv. 7b.12b.17a+b—linear; see also *mn* in v. 15a+b!
ky, vv. 10a.17a
mṣwt ... *ṣpnty/nṣmty*, vv. 12 and 17a resp. (alliter.)–linear

vv. 3–4.8–9.13–14: *my*, vv. 3a.13a!—linear
yd'/byn, vv. 3a and 8b respectively—linear
-hw, vv. 3a.8a.13a—exactly linear
'śh, vv. 9a.13b!

In the last line of the strophe: *ph*, vv. 4b.12b!
ḥq, vv. 12b.14a!

Cf. in the first line of the strophe: *yd'*, *-hw* and *byn*

The concentric arrangement of the cantos around v. 10.

vv. 3–4.15–17: *pnym*, vv. 4a.15a+17a+b!
vv. 5–7.13–14: *rbb*, vv. 6a.14b!
hw', vv. 6b.13a!
'mw, vv. 7a.14b!
vv. 8–9.11–12: *wl'*, vv. 8–9.11–12 (cf. above)

9.4.5 Remaining verbal repetitions

9.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration

-w, *-y* (vv. 2, 4), *l'*

9.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration

b-, *k-*, *l-*

9.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2.3–7.8–12.13–17|... (1.5.5.5|...)
Stickel (1842): 2–5.6–9.10–13.14–17... (4×4); similarly Ewald (1854), Ley (1895) and cf. König (1929)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9||10–12.13–14.15–17||... (4×2||3.2.3||...)
Merx (1871): 2–5.6–9.10–13.14–17... (4×8); similarly Delitzsch (1876), Dillmann (1891); cf. Ewald (1854)
Hitzig (1874): 2–7.8–12.13–17||... (6.5.5||...)
Wright (1883): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–17|... (4×6.8|...)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8+10.11–12.13+15.16–17...
Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.15–16.17+14*|...
Vetter (1897): 2–3.4–5.6–7|8–9|10–12.13–14|15–17|...; cf. Schlottmann (1851)

Hontheim (1904): 2–5.6–9|10–17|... (4.4|8|...); cf. Schlottmann (1851)
Schlögl (1916): 2–9.10–17... (16.16...); similarly TOB (1978) and Van Selms (1983); cf. Hontheim (1904)
Peters (1928): 2–3.4–5.6–7|8–9.10–12|13–14.15–17||... (2.2.2|2.3|2.3||...); cf. Vetter (1897)
Kissane (1939): 2–7.8–14.15–17+24,2–4|... (6.7.6|...)
Hölscher (1952): 2–3.4–5.6–7.10–11.12–13.15–16.17; cf. Duhm (1897)
Möller (1955): 2–17... (16...)
Skehan (1961): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–14.15–17... (3.3.3.4.3...); similarly MacKenzie (1990); cf. Wright (1883)
Fohrer (1963): 2–6.7+10–12.13+15–17 (5.4.4)
Terrien (1963): 2–5.6–7|8–9.10–12|13–14.15–17|...
NAB (1970): 2–7.8–14.15–17...
KBS (1980): 2.3–7.8–12.13–17...
De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.6–7.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17; cf. Hölscher (1952)
Webster (1983): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–14.15–17; cf. Skehan (1961)
Rozelaar (1984): 2–7.8–12.13–17...
Habel (1985): 2–17 (2.3.4–7.8–12.13–16.17; a.b.c.d.c'.a'.)
Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–3.4–5.6–7|8–9.10–12|13–14.15–17||... (2.2.2|2.3|2.3||...)
Hartley (1988): 2–7.8–12.13–17||...
Lescow (1992), pp. 146–48: 2–3.4–5.6–7|10.11–12.13|15–16.17 (3×4|2.4.2|4.2; a.b.c)

9.6 Comments and summary

According to MT, chs. 23–24 form one large-scale speech by Job. On the basis of a rhetorical analysis it can be establihed that these two chapters represent two individual poems and that the chapter division exactly marks the dividing line between the successive poems. The compositions distinguish themselves from each other by a different poetic structure. That is to say they display a different canto-length and different responsions; see anal. 10.6 below (final paragraph).[1]

Analysis 9.5 makes it clear that there is no consensus among scholars about the overall structure of the poem in ch. 23. Some divide this poem into two main parts (of eight lines each), vv. 2–9 and 10–17.[2] Others discern four units (of four lines each), vv. 2–5, 6–9, 10–13 and 14–17.[3] Other critics, again, primarily find groupings of three verses.[4] Habel, finally, does not discern a regular pattern of successive 'strophes', but points to a concentric design for the poem as a whole; see anal. 9.5. So, it would probably be wise to start with defining the pattern of the verbal responsions on the level of the poem as a whole in order to find its main caesuras. On the basis of this formal approach I conclude that the poem divides into three main sections (cantos) of five lines each, vv. 3–7, 8–12, 13–17, which are preceded by a relatively independent mono-line unit, v. 2; see the verbal repetitions noted in anal. 9.4.4 in connection with the *linear* arrangement of the cantos. Canto II also stands out by the expression *wl'* ('and not'); see anal. 9.4.3. The linear, external parallelism between the three successive cantos, which is constituted by these responsions, is enhanced by a corresponding *linear*, external parallelism of ideas/themes (see anal. 9.2 and cf. Bezuidenhout, p. 260). The beginning of the cantos focusses on a quality of God: his untraceability (cantos I and II) and arbitrariness (canto III). The end of the cantos, each time, focus on a quality of Job himself: his innocence (cantos I and II) and his anxiety (canto III).[5] This *linear* parallelism between the cantos is furthermore confirmed by their strophic structure (see below).

---

[1] As will be shown besides, ch. 24 is not even a continuation of Job's reply to Eliphaz in ch. 23, but a speech by one of the friends, Bildad I think. See also part VII, 1.1.

The cantos are preceded by a mono-line strophe (so also Köster and KBS!), which functions as an introduction to the poem as a whole (v. 2).[6] From v. 3 onwards we meet the subject proper of the poem (see below). Nevertheless, the introductory strophe of v. 2 seamlessly links up with the (thematic and formal) linear parallelism between the successive cantos; see anal. 9.2 (note 'about Job') and 9.4.4 (note *'l*). From this perspective the strophe can be taken as the last line of an incomplete canto.

Taking the rhetorical framework of ch. 23 on the level of the cantos for granted, the strophic structure of this poem is (again) rather easy to discern. See for the strophic structure of cantos II and III anal. 9.2.[7] See for cantos I and III the linear, verbal repetitions described in anal. 9.4.3. From this formal point of view the strophes of canto I constitute a beautiful *parallelismus stropharum.* So, the poem does not only display a regular canto structure of five lines, but the cantos themselves are also quite regularly built up out of a two- and a three-line strophe each. This regular strophic pattern is finally supported by the responsions on the level of the poem as a whole; see *byn* ('to understand'), *ḥq* ('statute'), *-hw* ('his') in anal. 9.4.4, and especially for the demarcation of the strophes in canto I *yd'* ('to know'), *-ny*, *'mr* ('to say'), *ph* ('mouth').

---

[2] So Schlottmann, Hontheim, Schlögl, TOB, Van Selms; see anal. 9.5. Descriptive phrases such as TOB's, 'Absence de Dieu' (vv. 2–9) and 'Présence de Dieu' (vv. 10–17), do no justice to the recurring theme of Job's innocence. Cf. Budde and Weiser, who divide into vv. 2–12 and 13–17.

[3] So Stickel, Ley, Ewald, Merx, Delitzsch, Dillmann, König.

[4] See Wright, Skehan, Webster, MacKenzie in anal. 9.5.

[5] For this threepartite structure see also Köster, Hitzig, Peters, Terrien, KBS, Rozelaar, Bezuidenhout, Hartley (anal. 9.5).

[6] For the special character of such introductory strophes see part VI, 1.2.6. Note *śḥy* in v. 2a; cf. 21,4a.

[7] So also Schlottmann, Vetter, Peters, Terrien (anal. 9.5); see also the translation by Gordis and the commentary by Habel, pp. 349–51.

The rhetorical analysis of ch. 23 suggests that the poem exhibits *two main points.* The first main point, I think, is to be found in the first strophes of the cantos, vv. 3–4, 8–9, 13–14, especially in the first strophe of canto I, v. 3. This line formulates the theme of the poem as a whole: *Job cannot find God.* The second main point is indicated by the concentric framework of the poem, with v. 10 as the pivotal line; see again anal. 9.4.4.[8] In this line, Job again—and for the 'last time'—affirms his *innocence* and his conviction that God is also aware of this fact (cf. Lescow, p. 148).

The rhetorical structure of the cantos in ch. 23 is very similar to the structure of the cantos in the preceding chapter. Here as well as in ch. 22, the cantos open with a statement *about God* as a transcendent deity. Eliphaz urges Job in these lines to turn to God and to show contrition (note 22,21–25). In the corresponding lines of ch. 23 Job replies that he cannot find this transcendent deity (note vv. 3–4 and 8–9). Then follows, here as well as in ch. 22, a statement *about Job.* In the lines concerned Eliphaz accuses Job of being a wicked person (note vv. 6–9 and 15–18). In the corresponding lines of ch. 23 Job emphasizes that he is innocent (see vv. 5–7 and 10–12). The last strophe of canto III (vv. 15–17) corresponds to the end of cantos I and II in ch. 22 (vv. 10–11 and 20), because all these lines allude to *death.*[9] This final strophe of ch. 23 is especially an immediate reaction and answer to Eliphaz's explanation of Job's anxiety in 22,10–11

---

[8] This concentric arrangement partially goes along with Habel's design (pp. 346–47); see anal. 9.5. This design correctly makes it clear that (also from a rhetorical point of view) vv. 8–12 represent the central unit of the poem; note *wl'* in anal. 9.4.3. The alleged symmetric correspondences, however, are almost completely founded on a thematic analysis. With the exception of *pnym* ('face') in vv. 4 and 17 (but note also v. 15a!), Habel does not take into account the symmetric verbal repetitions described in anal. 9.4.4 (*rbb* etc.); the other words in italics on pp. 346–47 do not support Habel's *concentric* design. Nor does Habel's design allow for the most explicit, rhetorical framework of the poem, the *linear* external parallelism between vv. 3–7, 8–12 and 13–17.

[9] Habel correctly notes with reference to 23,17 that we are dealing here with 'the poet's favorite practice of closing a speech with the theme of death or darkness' (p. 347). This device of closure, however, is not restricted to v. 17 alone, but characterizes all of the vv. 15–17; note *bhl* in vv. 15–16 and *pḥd* in v. 15b.

(final strophe of canto I); note *ʿl kn, bhl, pḥd, ḥšk/ ʾpl, ksh.*[10] In 23,15–17 Job makes clear it that he is frightened because God has made his heart sink (v. 16). This anxiety is caused by God's arbitrariness (vv. 13–14), and not related by Job to God's punishment of his wickedness.[11]

---

[10] See also Dhorme about vv. 15–16 and cf. Fohrer and Weiser.

[11] Cf. also *ʿd tkwntw* in 23,3 with *ʿd šdy* in 22,23, *špṭ* in 23,4.7 with *špṭ* in 22,4.13, *drk* in 23,10–11 with *drk* in 22,3.15.28, *ʾmry pyw* in 23,12 with *ʾmryw* in 22,22. See furthermore the function of *ky* as a responsion on the level of the strophes in the final canto of ch. 23 (vv. 13–17) and in the final canticle of ch. 22 (vv. 26–30). The units in question also correspond by their length of five lines.

10 ‘Bildad’s third speech’: Job 24

Structure: 13.13 > 7.6|6.7 > 1.3.3|3.3||2.2.2|2.2.2.1

I.1	1	*mdw‘* **mšdy** *l’ nṣpnw ‘tym*	*wyd‘w l’ ḥzw ymyw*	
	2	*gblwt yśygw*	*‘dr* **gzlw** *wyr‘w*	
	3	*ḥmwr* **ytwmym** *ynhgw*	**yḥblw** *šwr ’lmnh*	
	4	*yṭw ’BYWNYM mDRK*	*YḤD ḥb’w* **‘nyy** *’RṢ*	
	5	*hn pr’ym bmdbr*	*yṣ’w bp‘lm*	
		mšḥry lṭrp ‘rbh	*lw lḥm ln‘rym*	
	6	*bśdh blylw yqṣyrw*	*wKRM rš‘ ylqšw*	
I.2	7	‘RWM *ylynw m*BLY LBWŠ	*w’YN kswt bqrh*	
	8	*mzrm hrym yrṭbw*	*wmbly mḥsh ḥbqw ṣwr*	
	9	*YGZLW mšd* **ytwṃ**	*w‘l ‘NY* **yḥblw**	
	10	‘RWM *hlkw* BLY LBWŠ	*wr‘bym nś’w ‘mr*	
	11	*byn šwrtm yṣhyrw*	*yqbym DRKW wyṣm’w*	[*tplh*
	12	*m‘yr mtym yn’qw*	*wnpš ḥllym tšw‘*	*w’***lwh** *l’ yśym*

II.1	13	*hmh hyw bmrdy ’wr*	*l’* HKYRW *DRKYw*	*wl’ yšbw bntybtyw*
	14	*l’wr yqwm rwṣḥ*	*yqṭl ‘NY w’BYWN*	*wblylh yhy kgnb*
	15	*w‘yn n’p šmrh nšp*	*l’mr l’ tšwrny ‘yn*	*wstr pnym yśym*
	16	*ḥtr bḥšk btym*	*ywmm ḥtmw lmw*	*l’ yd‘w ’wr*
	17	*ky YḤDW bqr lmw ṣlmwt*	*ky* YKYR *blhwt ṣlmwt*	
	18	*ql hw’* **‘l** *pny mym*	*tqll ḥlqtm b’RṢ*	*l’ ypnh* **drk** [*KRMYM*
II.2	19	*ṣyh gm ḥm YGZLW mymy*	*š’wl ḥṭ’w*	
	20	*yškḥhw rḥm mtqw rmh* [*šlg*	*‘wd l’ yzkr*	*wtšbr k‘ṣ ‘wlh*
	21	*r‘h ‘qrh l’ tld*	*w’lmnh l’ yyṭyb*	
	22	*wmšk ’byrym bkḥw*	*yqwm wl’ y’myn bḥyyn*	
	23	*ytn lw lbṭḥ wyš‘n*	*w‘ynyhw* **‘l** *DRKYhm*	
	24	*rwmw m‘ṭ w’YNnw*	*whmkw kkl yqpṣwn*	*wkr’š šblt ymlw*
	25	*w’m l’ ’pw my ykzybny*	*wyśm l’l mlty*	

10.1 Text

V. 1a: ‘Why are times for judgment not reserved by Shaddai?’ (NJPS; so also Driver-Gray, Pope, De Wilde, Van Selms among others); see for *ṣpn* as ‘reserve, lay up’ Job 21,19 20,26. Gordis argues that *ṣpn* in 24,1 has the usual meaning ‘to conceal, hide’ (see also HAL) and that *mdw‘* in v. 1a only governs v. 1b (so also Rozelaar, Habel and Hartley).

V. 5: the accentuation of MT suggests that we are dealing with a tricolon; cf. vv. 12, 14, 18, 24 (so Budde, König, Pope, NJPS, Habel; cf. also BHS). I follow the opinion of Dhorme, Hölscher, Fohrer, Gordis, Van Selms and Hartley and take this verse as two bicola. This interpretation is favoured by the three-line strophes of canto I. *‘rbh* belongs to the first colon of the second line (contra the accentuation of MT).

V. 9: scholars generally relocate this verse after v. 3. However, the change ‘destroys the continued poetic interplay of oppressor and oppressed’ (so rightly Habel); note also Gordis, pp. 253.531. See anal. 10.4.4 below.

V. 9b—*‘l*: I revocalize the text with most modern scholars and read ‘infant’. MT ‘upon’.

V. 12c—*tplh*: ‘wrong, reproach’ (cf. 1,22); so MT (König, Kroeze, Epping-Nelis, Gordis, Habel, Hartley). Some revocalize the word to read ‘prayer’ (with Pesh.).

V. 16a: this colon is frequently read immediately after v. 14c (Vetter, Budde, Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Weiser, Epping-Nelis, Pope, Loretz, Hartley). This literary surgery, however, upsets the linear parallelism between the strophes in canticle II.1; note anal. 10.4.3 and cf. above, about v. 9 (see also Gordis, p. 534).

Vv. 19–20: for the ‘perfect sequence of mythological imagery’ in these lines (MT) see J.B. Geyer, *VT* 42 (1992), pp. 118–20; against J.B. Burns, *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 480–84.

V. 24b—*kkl*: *kl* is perhaps some sort of grass (Pope, Gordis, Van Selms; see also Hartley). Since the translation ‘like all’ offers no clear parallel with v. 24c most modern scholars follow LXX and read *kmlwḥ* (‘as mallow’).

10.2 Content

You say: God tolerates much injustice on earth; but I say: in the end the evildoers will perish.

I The lack of retribution: God tolerates much injustice on earth (quotation).
    I.1 Why does God not pass judgement on the wrongdoers (v. 1a) and save the poor (v. 1b)?
        The evildoers rob and oppress the poor of the land (vv. 2–4).
        The poor have to find and gather their food like animals (vv. 5–6).

I.2 The evildoers rob the poor of clothing, home and protection (vv. 7–9; cf. vv. 2–4).
The poor have to gather the harvest from the fields, but they themselves are hungry and thirsty (vv. 10–12; cf. vv. 5–6).

II The evildoers, who are working in darkness, will soon be punished (answer).

II.1 Description of the way of life of the godless workers of darkness.
The oppressors are working in the dark of the night (vv. 13–14).
Adultery is also committed at night (vv. 15–16).
Life is not successful for these workers of darkness (vv. 17–18).

II.2 The ruin of the evildoers.
The end of the evildoers is death (vv. 19–20).
Although they rob the poor, these tyrants do not have their lives in their own hands (vv. 21–22).
After a short period of prosperity they are brought low (vv. 23–24; cf. vv. 19–20).
Just try to disagree with me! (v. 25).

10.3 Transition markers

10.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

10.3.1.1 *hn*, v. 5a
w- beginning line, v. 15a
w- beginning line, v. 25a
’pw, v. 25a
my, v. 25a

10.3.1.2 *mdw’*, v. 1a
hmh, v. 13a (see Gordis, p. 533)
gm, v. 19a

10.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

10.3.2.1 *rš‘*, v. 6b

10.3.2.2 *hw’*, v. 18a

10.3.3 Contrary indications

’mr, v. 15b
w- beginning line, v. 22a

10.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

10.4.1 General survey

’: *’bywn*, vv. 4, 14; *’wr*, vv. 13, 14, 16; *’yn*, vv. 7, 24; *’lmnh*, vv. 3, 21; *’rṣ*, vv. 4, 18
b: *b-*, vv. 5, 5, 6, 7, 13, 13, 14, 16, 18, 22, 22; *bly*, vv. 7, 8, 10
g: *gzl*, vv. 2, 9, 19
d: *drk*, vv. 4, 11, 13, 18, 23
h: *-hw*, vv. 20, 23, 24; *hyh*, vv. 13, 14
w: *-w*, vv. 1, 1, 5, 6, 13, 13, 17, 20, 22, 23
ḥ: *ḥbl*, vv. 3, 9
y: *yd‘*, vv. 1, 16; *ywm*, vv. 1, 16; *yḥd*, vv. 4, 17; *ytwm*, vv. 3, 9
k: *k-*, vv. 14, 20, 24, 24; *ky*, vv. 17, 17; *krm*, vv. 6, 18
l: *l-*, vv. 5 (3×), 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 23, 25; *l’*, vv. 1, 1, 12, 13, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 21, 22, 25; *lbš*, vv. 7, 10
m: *-m*, vv. 5, 18—see also *-m* in vv. 11 and 16; *-mw*, vv. 16, 17; *mym*, vv. 18, 19; *mll* (‘to wither’)/*mll* (‘to say’), vv. 24 and 25 resp.; *mn*, vv. 1, 4, 7, 8, 8, 9, 12
n: *-ny*, vv. 15, 25; *nkr*, vv. 13, 17
‘: *‘yn*, vv. 15, 15, 23; *‘l*, vv. 18, 23—see also *‘l* in v. 9; *‘ny*, vv. 4, 9, 14; *‘rwm*, vv. 7, 10
p: *pnh*, vv. 15, 18, 18
ṣ: *ṣlmwt*, vv. 17, 17
q: *qwm*, vv. 14, 22; *qll*, vv. 18, 18
r: *r‘h*, vv. 2, 21
ś: *śym*, vv. 12, 15, 25
š: *šwr* (‘ox’)/*šwrh* (‘row’)/*šwr* (‘to see’), vv. 3, 11 and 15 resp.

10.4.2 Within the strophes

vv. 2–4: *yśygw*/*ynhgw*, vv. 2a and 3a resp.—alliteration (‘rhyme’)
vv. 5–6: *mdbr*/*‘rbh*, vv. 5a and 5c resp.—linear
vv. 7–9: *mbly*, vv. 7a.8b; see also *mn* in vv. 8a and 9a
vv. 10–12: *‘rwm* ... *wr‘bym* ... *‘mr*/*šwrtm*/*m‘yr*, vv. 10, 11 and 12 resp.—alliteration
vv. 13–14: *hyh*, vv. 13a.14c!
b-, vv. 13a+c.14c
mrd/*qwm*, vv. 13a and 14a resp.
’wr, vv. 13a.14a

vv. 15–16: *l'*, vv. 15b.16c
vv. 19–20: *ḥṭ'/'wl*, vv. 19b and 20c resp.!
vv. 23–24: *-hw*, vv. 23b.24a

10.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 7–12 (I.2): *'rwm ylynw mbly lbwš/'rwm hlkw bly lbwš*, vv. 7a and 10a resp.—exactly linear; see also *mbly* in vv. 8b
'rwm/wr'bym, vv. 7a and 10b resp.—alliteration

vv. 13–18 (II.1): *'wr*, vv. 13a.14a.16c!
nkr hiph'il, vv. 13b.17b!—linear
drk, vv. 13b.18c—inclusio
blylh/bḥšk, vv. 14c and 16a resp.—linear } chiasm
gnb/ḥtr, vv. 14c and 16a resp.!—linear
nšp/bqr, vv. 15a and 17a resp.—linear
pnh, vv. 15c.18a+c!
b-, vv. 16a.18b—linear; see also *b-* in vv. 13–14
-m/-m, vv. 16b.18b—linear
ḥtmw/ḥlqtm, vv. 16b and 18b resp. (allit.)—linear
lmw, vv. 16b.17a!—concatenatio
l', vv. 16c.18c—exactly linear

vv. 19–25 (II.2): *-hw*, vv. 20a.23b+24a!
k-, vv. 20c.24b+c—linear
š'wl ḥṭ'w/lw lbṭḥ, vv. 19b and 23a resp. (allit.)—linear

10.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–12 (canto I): *mn*, vv. 1a+4a.7–9+12a!
šdy/'lwh, vv. 1a and 12c resp.!—inclusio
l', vv. 1a.12c—inclusio
'tym/yśym tplh, vv. 1a and 12c resp. (alliter.)—inclusio
gzl, vv. 2b.9a—linear
ytwm, vv. 3a.9a!—linear
yḥblw, vv. 3b.9b!—linear
šwr/šwrh, vv. 3b and 11a resp.—alliter.
drk, vv. 4a.11b
ḥb'w/ḥbqw, vv. 4b and 8b resp. (alliter.)—linear
'ny, vv. 4b.9b—exactly linear

pr’/n’q, vv. 5a and 12a resp.—linear; cf. *hynhq pr’* in Job 6,5a
-m/-m, vv. 5b and 11a resp.–linear
blylw/ylynw mbly lbwš, vv. 6a and 7a resp. (alliter.)—concatenatio
yqṣyrw/yṣhyrw, vv. 6a and 11a resp. (alliter.)—linear
rš‘/tplh, vv. 6b and 12c resp.!—linear

vv. 13–25 (canto II): *drkym*, vv. 13b.23b—inclusio; cf. *drk* in canto I
yqwm, vv. 14a.22b!
k-, vv. 14c.20c—exactly linear; see also 24b+c!
‘yn, vv. 15a+b.23b!
‘l, vv. 18a.23b!—linear
mym, vv. 18a.19a!—concatenatio
drk, vv. 18c.23b—linear
mll/mll, vv. 24c and 25b resp. (alliter.)—concat.

10.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 1–6.13–18: *yd‘*, vv. 1b.16c! } chiasm
ywm, vv. 1b.16b! } chiasm
šwr/šwr, vv. 3b and 15b resp.—alliteration
’bywn, vv. 4a.14b!—linear
drk, vv. 4a.13b—linear; see also v. 18c
yḥd, vv. 4b.17a!
‘ny, vv. 4b.14b—linear
’rṣ, vv. 4b.18b!
-m, vv. 5b.18b
blylw/wblylh, vv. 6a and 14c resp.—alliteration
krm, vv. 6b.18c!—exactly linear
-ny, vv. 15b.25a!

vv. 7–12.19–25: *l’*, vv. 1a+b.12c—linear
’yn, vv. 7b.24a!
ygzlw, vv. 9a.19a—linear
‘mr/šblt, vv. 10b and 24c resp.; cf. Ruth 2,2.7.15
drk, vv. 11b.23b—linear
w’lwh l’/l’ . . . l’l, v. 12c and 25 resp. (allit.)—linear
śym, vv. 12c.25b—exactly linear

vv. 2–4.21–22, ‘inclusio’: *r‘h*, vv. 2b.21a!
’lmnh, vv. 3b.21b!
cf. *rš‘/ḥṭ’* in vv. 6b and 19b resp.

vv. 10–12.13–14, concatenatio: *drk*, vv. 11b.13b
l’, vv. 12c.13b+c

10.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

10.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

b-, *l’*, *śym* (v. 15)

10.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

-w, (*ky*), *l-*, (*ṣlmwt*), (*qll*)

10.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): . . . |1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–24.25 (. . . |4.4.4.6.6.1)
Stickel (1842): . . . 1–4.5–8.9–12.13–17.18–21.22–25 (. . . 4.4.4.5.4.4)
Schlottmann (1851): . . . ||1–4.5–8.9–12||13.14–15.16–17|18–19.20–21.22–24 25 (. . . ||4.4.4||1.2.2|2.2.3 1)
Ewald (1854): . . . |1–4.5–8.9–12.13.14–17.18–21.22–25 (4.4.4.1.4.4.4)
Merx (1871): . . . 1–4.5–7.8–. . . [9–24].25 (. . . 8.8. . . [. . .].2)
Hitzig (1874): . . . ||1–4.5–8.9–12|13–16.17–21.22–24|25 (. . . ||4.4.4|4.5.3|1)
Delitzsch (1876): . . . |1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–17.18–21.22–25 (. . . |8.3×9.5.10.9)
Wright (1883): . . . |1–3.4–5.6–8.10–12|13–15.14c+16–17+19.18+20–21.22–25 (. . . |6.6.6.7|8.8.8.9)
Dillmann (1891): . . . ||1–4.5–8.9–12|13–17.18–21.22–25 (. . . ||8.9.9|14.10.9); cf. Stickel (1842)
Bickell (1894): . . . 1–2.3–4.[. . .]25*
Ley (1895): . . . |1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–17+21–22.23–25 (. . . |5×4.3)
Duhm (1897): . . . |[1.2–3a.3b–4|5a–c.5d–6.10b–11.8+10a.12|13.14.15.16.17–18a|18b–19*.20–21a.21b–22a.22b–23; all tricola, not spoken by Job].25
Vetter (1897): . . . |1|2–4|5–6.7–8.10–12|13–14b+15.14c+16–17|[18–21.]22–23[.24]|25
Hontheim (1904): . . . |1–3+9.4–6|7–8+10–11|13–17.21+12+22–25 (. . . |4.4|4|6.6)
Schlögl (1916): . . . 1–4+5c–6+10–11.12–15+16b–17 (. . . 16.16)

Peters (1928): . . . ||1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12|13–15a.15b–16b.16c–18a.18b–20.21–23.24–25 (. . . ||6×2|3.2.2.3.3.2)
König (1929): . . . 1–4.5–8.9–12.13–17.18–21.22–25; cf. Dillmann (1891)
Kissane (1939): . . . |1+5–8+10–11.12a–b+9+14–16.12c+13+17–20.21–25 (. . . |7.6.7.6)
Hölscher (1952): 1–2.3–4.5.6–7.8+10.11–12b.12c–13.[14a–b+15a–b.14c+15c+16a+18a.16b–c+17.]18b–c+19.20a–b+21.22–23.24a+20c+24b–c 25
RSV (1952): . . . 1–12.13–17.18–20.21–25
Möller (1955): . . . 1–8.9–24.25 (. . . 8.16.1)
Skehan (1961): . . . 1–3.4–5.6–9. . . ? (. . . 3.3.4. . . ?)
Fohrer (1963): [1–4+10–12a+c+22–23; 5–8; 13*+14+16a+15a–b+16b–c+17; 18–21* (‘Vier Lieder’)]
Terrien (1963): . . . |1–3+9.4–5|6–8.10–11|12–13.14–17|(Zophar?:)x+18.19–20|21–23.24–25|. . .
TOB (1978): . . . |1–11|12–18|19–20.21–25
KBS (1980): . . . 1.2–4.5–8.9–12.13–20.21–24.25
Loretz (1980): 1–4; 5b–8; 9–12; 13b–16; 18b–25
De Wilde (1981): 1.2–3.9+4.5a+c+6.7–8.10–11.12+5c.[13–18a.20–24.]25+27,12
Van Selms (1983): . . . 1–12.25 (Bildad: 13–24)
Webster (1983): 1–3.4–5.6–8.9–12; 13–17.18–21.22–24 25
Rozelaar (1984): . . . 1–4.5–8.9.10–12.13–17.18–24.[. . .]25
Habel (1985): 1.2–12.13–17.18–20.21.22–24.25 (a.b.b’.c.b”.d.e; Zophar)
Bezuidenhout (1986): . . . 1–4.5–6.7–8.9–12|13–14.15–16a.16b–17|18–20.21–23.24–25 (. . . ||4.3.2.4|2.2.2|3.3.2)
Hartley (1988): . . . ||1–3+9+4–8+10–11.12–14+16a+15+16b–17|18–25
MacKenzie (1990): . . . |1–12|13–17|18–24|25

10.6 Comments and summary

‘This chapter is undoubtedly one of the most difficult in the book, with regard to its form, its content, and its relevance to the context’ (Gordis, p. 531). According to MT ch. 24 forms the second part of a speech by Job, which was begun in ch. 23. And if we should only take into account the first half of the poem there is no reason at all to doubt the reliability of the masoretic tradition on this point. Vv. 1–12 at least (cf. also vv. 13–17) are perfectly understandable when coming from Job. These lines deal with the problem of the suffering of the socially weak and the fact that God does not intervene to establish a moral order in the world. These ideas can be seen as an immediate elaboration of Job’s accusation that God is an unfathomable despot; see 23,13–14 (Budde). From v. 18 onwards, however, we read about the destruction of the evildoers. And this theme is quite opposed to Job's stand; see especially ch. 21. Contemporary critics, therefore, frequently deny that these words (or part of the lines from v. 18 onwards) are spoken by Job.[1] Others, however, make an attempt to explain that these words are possibly spoken by Job; so Möller (pp. 53–54), Weiser, Andersen, Gordis, Hartley, Wolfers[2]. Gordis argues in this connection that vv. 18–24 are a quotation by Job of the friends' ideas on the retribution imposed on the wicked. However, Gordis has to assume now that this quotation was originally followed by Job's rebuttal, which was subsequently lost (pp. 253 and 533).[3]

The last mentioned opinion can be appreciated insofar it presumes that ch. 24 forms an inseparable whole; especially against Fohrer, Loretz (p. 266), De Wilde (p. 254). Habel quite correctly observes that 'a basic unity and coherence is apparent in this chapter' (p. 355; see also Gordis, Special Note 19, pp. 531–34)! Vv. 2–12 and 18–24 belong together, according to Habel, on the basis of a comparison of the language, 'thematic and terminological links' (p. 356; see also Hölscher, p. 61). Habel points in this connection to *yqbym drkw* and *drk krmym* in vv. 11 and 18 resp., *r'h* in vv. 2 21, *gzl* in vv. 2 9 19, *'lmnh* in vv. 3 21. Anal. 10.4.5 shows that there are far more verbal correspondences between the first and the second part of this chapter. The basically linear pattern in which these repetitions are grouped (vv. 1–6 corresponds with vv. 13–18 and vv. 7–12 with vv. 19–25) makes it unquestionably clear that we are dealing in ch. 24 with a self-contained poem, which is composed of two identical cantos of thirteen lines, vv. 1–12 and 13–25.[4] The fundamental unity of this poem also comes to light by the identical canto length of thirteen lines and by the symmetric design the poem displays on the level of the canticles (vv. 1–6, 7–12, 13–18, 19–25): 7.6|6.7 lines (see for these divisions below).

Apart from the first mono-line strophe, canto I is entirely composed of strophes of *three* lines.[5] The first strophe of this canto (v. 1) contains two themes: the 'suspension' of the punishment of the wicked (v. 1a) and the 'postponement' of the salvation of the poor (v. 1b). These themes alternately recur in the following strophes.[6] Vv. 2–4 are a working-out of the first idea, God leaves the evildoers to their own devices. Vv. 5–6 develop the second idea, God does not save the oppressed.[7] In vv. 7–9 we again meet with the first idea (see v. 9), while vv. 10–12 are again fully devoted to the second idea. This thematic alternation creates a semantic parallelism between vv. 1–6 and 7–12, which is obviously supported by the formal approach in anal. 10.4.4. This rhetorical framework also constitutes the canticle division of canto I, vv. 1–6, 7–12. Vv. 7–9 only partially match the parallelism between these canticles; note vv. 7–8. This feature, however, can simply be explained by the strong, external parallelism between the beginning of the strophes in canticle I.2 itself; see anal. 10.4.3 (cf. also *'yn* in anal. 10.4.5).

---

[1] See Ley, Vetter, Hontheim, Schlögl, Terrien in anal. 10.5; so also Dhorme, Epping-Nelis and Pope (cf. NAB). De Wilde and Van Selms take this position as to vv. 13–24, Duhm, Fohrer, Loretz as to vv. 1–24/25 (cf. also Bickell and Skehan in anal. 10.5).

[2] See D. Wolfers, 'The speech-cycles in the book of Job', *VT* 43 (1993), pp. 385–402.

[3] So also Rozelaar, pp. 65–66 n. RSV only takes vv. 18–20 as a quotation by Job, and TOB restricts this interpretation to vv. 19–20; cf. also Möller, p. 53.

[4] Cf. Schlottmann, Wright, Dillmann, Peters and Webster in anal. 10.5.

[5] Cf. Vetter in anal. 10.5.

The first canto is demarcated by a thematic inclusio. V. 12c, 'and God does not notice wrongdoing', refers back to the opening colon of the poem, 'why are times for judgment not reserved by Shaddai?' (v. 1a); see also anal. 10.4.4.[8] Thus, v. 12c is a pause (Epping-Nelis, p. 111).

The second canto also divides into two canticles, vv. 13–18 and 19–25. This canticle division is partially based on the *linear*, verbal repetitions described in anal. 10.4.5; note *krm* ('vineyard') in the last line of canticles I.1 and II.1 (vv. 18c and 6b), and *'rṣ* ('land') in vv. 18b and 4b. Canticle II.1 is characterized by the key notions of 'night' and 'darkness'. The final line of canticle II.1 (v. 18) contains the first allusion in the poem to the doom of the wicked.[9] This idea, then, is elaborated in canticle II.2—thematic extension. I would tentatively argue that, apart from the final mono-line strophe (v. 25), canto II is entirely composed of *two*-line strophes; see the linear, verbal repetitions in anal. 10.4.3 and for canticle II.2 anal. 10.2. The root *śym* in v. 25b forms a responsio with the same root in v. 12c (anal. 10.4.5). This suggests that v. 25 should not be taken as a relatively independent line within the framework of the poem (cf. 5,27), but is integrated into the canto structure itself; cf. 9,24c (!) 18,21 20,29.

---

[6] Cf. Gordis, pp. 253 and 531; against Wolfers, *art. cit.*, p. 387.

[7] The final colon of the preceding strophe (v. 4b), with 'the poor of the earth' as subject, already points forward to vv. 5–6; thematic extension.

[8] Hölscher aptly notes that *šdy* without the parallel expression *'l* or *'lwh* does not occur in the book of Job. He therefore takes *mšdy* in v. 1a as an explanatory gloss. This emendation, however, does not take into account the phenomenon of 'distant parallelism' and destroys the clear device of inclusio in canto I; cf. *šdy* in 6,14 and *'lwh* in 6,4c (// *šdy* in 6,4a; see part II, 5).

[9] The line is generally connected with the following verses; see anal. 10.5. However, there is also a remarkable, formal correspondence between vv. 17 and 18, which possibly marks the end of canticle II.1; note *ky* at the beginning of vv. 17a and 17b, *ṣlmwt* at the end of vv. 17a and 17b, the root *qll* at the beginning of vv. 18a and 18b and *pnh* in vv. 18a and 18c. See for vv. 13–18, 19–25 also Köster in anal. 10.5.

So, the rhetorical analysis does not give rise to the supposition that a part of the poem got lost (against Gordis; see alo Habel, p. 357). This leads to the observation that Job cannot be the speaker in ch. 24. Thus, we are most likely to deal here with a speech by one of the friends. We have to assume, then, that in canto 1 we find a quotation of Job's standpoint regarding the lack of moral order in the world. Habel actually takes the question of v. 1 as a reflection of 'a claim of the protagonist which requires refutation' (p. 356). In vv. 2 17, then, the friends are supposed to make concessions to Job's standpoint, and not to take a hard line throughout! This interpretation, however, is as unthinkable as the view that Job might have spoken the words of vv. 18 24. Habel's view does no justice to the overall design of the book of Job (see part VII) and much harm to the fact that the discussion between Job and his friends reaches a deadlock. When we take into consideration the preceding speeches, a hardening of the mutual positions can be observed. We must therefore assume that the first canto as a whole (vv. 1–12) is meant as a reflection of Job's position. In ch. 21 *Job* quoted the standpoint of the friends to put their ideas definitely behind him (see anal. 7.6 above). In ch. 22 Eliphaz directly accused Job of being a wicked person. Nevertheless, in ch. 23 Job held on to his innocence. Now, in ch. 24 the *friends* settle scores with Job by first quoting his position and then refuting it. However, only the first line of the poem (v. 1) more or less explicitly formulates Job's standpoint; see 23,13 14. Next, from v. 2 onwards we meet an elaborate working-out of this view. With 'rhetorical finesse the speaker portrays the plight of the downtrodden and the abuses of the oppressors in vivid detail' (Habel). This portrayal, however, betrays a biting sarcasm. In this way the friends express their irritation. They say to Job: 'we know already your laments about God's unjust administration of the world'. With the elaboration of Job's standpoint in vv. 2 12 the speaker in fact characterizes Job's position as irrelevant moaning. The second canto (vv. 13–25), then, is a refutation of Job's claim that there is no justice in the world. The first line of this canto (v. 13) explicitly identifies the evildoers with the people who rebel against God. I propose to interpret this line as: *you* would not identify yourself with that group, would you?; note *hmh* in v. 13a. The pronoun *hmh* introduces here an (implicit) contrast; cf. Pss. 20,9 59,16 102,27 120,7.[10] From v. 13 onwards the poet recurs to an aspect of the first theme of canto I, the wrongdoings of the wicked.[11] In the context of the design of the speech-cycles in the book of Job, it is most natural to suppose that Bildad is the speaker in this poem; see part VII, 1.1.

---

[10] Against Wolfers (*art. cit.*, p. 388), who makes an attempt to eliminate all references to the dealings *of the wicked* from this chapter.

[11] It is remarkable that the noun *rš‘* or *ḥnp* should not play a part in the rhetorical structure of the poem; note *rš‘* in v. 6b.

These observations indicate that the *quintessential thought* of the poem is to be found in the second canto. In this part of the poem canticle II.2 (vv. 19–25) most explicitly formulates the main theme: *the evildoers will be destroyed* (note vv. 19–20 and 23–24). With this statement Bildad in the first place responds to Job's statement of God's arbitrariness in 23,13–14 and more generally to Job's observations in ch. 21 about the prosperity of the wicked. See for the relationship between chs. 24 and 23 also *śdy/'lwh* in 24,1.12 and *'l/šdy* in 23,16, *ṣpn* in 24,1 and 23,12, *ḥzh* 24,1 and 23,9, *ywm* in 24,1.16 and 23,2, *drk* in 24,4.11.13.18.23 and 23,10–11, *ksh* in 24,7 and 23,17, *pnh* in 24,15.18 and 23,4.15.17, *kḥ* in 24,22 and 23,6, *w'ynnw* in 24,24 and 23,8.

Ch. 24 obviously distinguishes itself from the preceding poem in ch. 23. In ch. 24 we meet cantos of thirteen lines, whereas ch. 23 displays cantos of five lines. The most characteristic responsions are also different. See for ch. 24 *'bywn*, *drk*, *yḥd*, *'rṣ*, *krm*, *'yn*, *gzl*, *'ny* and for ch. 23 *my*, *yd'*, *byn*, *'mr*, *'mdy*, *'śh*.

11 ‘Job’s third reply to Bildad’: Job 25–26

Structure: 8.9 1 > 2.3.3|3.3.3 1

I	2	*Hmšl wpḥd* **‘m***w*	*‘śh šlwm bmrwmyw*
	3	*Hyš mspr lgdwdyw*	*w‘L MY l’ yqwm ’wrhw*
	4	**wmh** *yṣdq ’nwš* **‘m** *’l*	**wmh** *yzkh ylwd ’šh*
	5	*hn ‘d yrḥ wl’ y’hyl*	*wkwkbym l’ zkw b‘ynyw*
	6	*’p ky ’nwš rmh*	*wbn ’dm twl‘h*
	2	**mh** *‘zrt ll’ KḤ*	*hwš‘t zrw‘ l’ ‘z*
	3	**mh** *y‘ṣt ll’ ḤKMH*	*wtwšyh lrb hwd‘t*
	4	*’t* **my** *hgdt mlyn*	*wNŠMT* **my** *yṣ’h mmk*

II	5	*Hrp’ym yḥwllw*	**mtḥt mym** *wšknyhm*
	6	*‘rwm š’wl ngdw*	*w’yn* **kswt** *l’bdwn*
	7	*nṭh ṣpwn ‘L thw*	*tlh ’rṣ ‘L bly mh*
	8	*ṣrr* **mym** *b‘byw*	*wl’ nbq‘ ‘nn* **tḥtm**
	9	*m’ḥz pny* **ksh**	*pršz* **‘ly***w* *‘nnw*
	10	*ḥq ḥg* **‘l** *pny* **mym**	*‘d tklyt ’wr ‘m ḥšk*
	11	*‘mwdy šmym yrwppw*	*wytmhw mg‘rtw*
	12	*bKḤw rg‘ hym*	*wbTBWNTw mḥṣ rhb*
	13	*bRWḤw šmym šprh*	*ḥllh ydw nḥš bryḥ*

B	14	*hn ’lh qṣwt drkw*	*wmh šmṣ dbr nšm‘ bw*	*wr‘m gbwrtw MY* *[ytbwnn*

11.1 Text

25,1: this verse, in my opinion, contains the original heading of ch. 24. Obviously, from the earliest times of tradition onwards there have been doubts about the identity of the speaker of the poems in chs. 24–26; Ms$^{Ken\ 196}$ namely reads here *’ywb* instead of *bldd hšḥy* (see also part VII, 1.1 and cf. 26,1 below).

25,3b—*’wrhw*: ‘his light’; so MT (Löhr, Kroeze, Pope, BHS, Gordis, Habel). This reading is supported by the overall structure of the poem (cf. 26,6; see anal. 11.6). In view of the internal parallelism others prefer to read *’wrbw* (‘his ambush’; cf. LXX).

26,1: this verse, in my opinion, contains the original heading of chs. 25–26 (cf.

25,1 above).

26,9a—*ksh*: = *ks’* (‘throne’); with Driver-Gray, Gordis, Van Selms, Habel.

26,12b—*wbtbwntw*: so Q; K *wbtwbntw*.

26,13a—*brwḥw*: the prep. *b-* is not due to dittography; cf. *bkḥw* in v. 12a (with Kroeze; cf. also Pope)—against Dhorme, Gordis, Van Selms, Habel.

26,13a—*šprh*: ‘subst. for adj.’ (Driver-Gray; similarly Kroeze and Fohrer).

11.2 Content

God’s awesome power and cosmic design.

I God’s overwhelming greatness and human futility.
  God’s fearsome dominion in heaven (25,2–3).
  A human being can never be found innocent and pure before this God (25,4–6).
  Your impotent speeches did not strengthen me greatly (26,2–4).
II God as the creator of cosmic order.
  God’s creative power related to the underworld (26,5–7).
  God’s creative power related to the waters above and upon the earth (26,8–10).
  God’s creative power related to the heavens and the defeat of the primordial chaos monsters (26,11–13).
B These facts but inadequately portray the awesome power of God (26,14).

11.3 Transition markers

11.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

11.3.1.1 *w-* beginning line, 25,4a
mh, 25,4a
’nwš, 25,4a
mh, 25,4b
mh, 26,2a; ext. // *mh* in 26,3a
hn, 26,14a
’lh, 26,14a
mh, 26,14b
my, 26,14c

11.3.1.2 no remarks

11.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

11.3.2.1 *’p*, 25,6a

11.3.2.2 *’nwš*, 25,6a
my, 26,4a
my, 26,4b
mh, 26,7b

11.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

h- interr., 25,3a
my, 25,3b
hn, 25,5a

11.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

11.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

ʼ: *ʼwr*, 25,3, 26,10; *ʼnwš*, 25,4, 6
b: *b-*, 25,2, 5, 26,8, 12, 12, 13, 14; *byn*, 26,12, 14
h: *h-* (article), 26,5, 12—cf. *h-* interr. in 25,3; *hn*, 25,5, 26,14
w: *-w*, 25,2, 2, 3, 5, 26,6, 8, 9, 9, 11, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14 (3×)
z: *zkh/zkk*, 25,4 and 5 respectively
k: *kḥ*, 26,2, 12; *ksh* (‘to cover’)/*ksh* (‘throne’), 26,6 and 9 respectively
l: *l-*, 25,3, 26,2, 3, 3, 6; *lʼ*, 25,3, 5, 5, 26,2, 2, 3, 8
m: *mh*, 25,4, 4, 26,2, 3, 7, 14; *my*, 25,3, 26,4, 4, 14; *mym*, 26,5, 8, 10; *mn*, 26,4, 5, 11
n: *ngd* (‘to tell’)/*ngd* (‘before’), 26,4 and 6 respectively
ʻ: *ʻd*, 25,5, 26,10; *ʻl*, 25,3, 26,7, 7, 9, 10; *ʻm* (prep.), 25,2, 4, 26,10; *ʻnn*, 26,8, 9
p: *pnh*, 26,9, 10
š: *šmym*, 26,11, 13
t: *tḥt*, 26,5, 8

11.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

25,2–3: *hmšl wpḥd/hyš mspr*, 25,2a and 3a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
-w, 25,2a.3a—exactly linear (‘rime’); see also *-w* in v. 2b
-w/-hw, 25,2b and 3b resp.—exactly linear
25,4–6: *ʼnwš*, 25,4a.6a!—inclusio; see also *ʼšh* in v. 4b and *ʼdm* in v. 6b
zkh/zkk, 25,4b and 5b resp.!; see also *ṣdq* in v. 4a
26,2–4: *mh*, 26,2a.3a—exactly linear; see also *my* in v. 4a+b
llʼ kḥ/llʼ ḥkmh, 26,2a and 3a resp. (alliter.)!—exactly linear; see also *lʼ* in v. 2b and *l-* in v. 3b
hwšʻt/wtwšyh/wnšmt, 26,2b, 3b and 4b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
hwšʻt/hwdʻt, 26,2b and 3b resp.—alliteration

26,8–10: *mym*, 26,8a.10a—inclusio
-w, 26,8a.9b (2×)
‘nn, 26,8b.9b!
pnym, 26,9a.10a!
‘l, 26,9b.10a
26,11–13: *šmym*, 26,11a.13a!—inclusio
mg‘rtw/rg‘, 26,11b and 12a resp.—alliteration
b-, 26,12a.13a—exactly linear; see also *b-* in v. 12b
bkḥw/brwḥw, 26,12a and 13a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear

11.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTOS

25,2–26,4 (canto I): *‘mw/‘m ’l*, 25,2a and 4a resp.—exactly linear
hyš/twšyh, 25,3a and 26,3b resp. (alliteration)
my, 25,3b.26,4a+b—linear
l’, 25,3b.5a+b.26,2–3
mh, 25,4a+b.26,2a+3a—linear

26,5–13 (canto II): *h-* (article), vv. 5a.12a!
hrp’ym yḥwllw/yrwppw, 26,5a and 11a resp. (alliter.)—linear (Fokkelman)
yḥwllw/ḥllh, 26,5a and 13b resp. (alliter.)—inclusio
mn, 26,5b.11b—linear
mtḥt/tḥtm, 26,5b.8b!—linear (alliter.)
mym, 26,5b.8a+10a!
-hm/-m, 26,5b and 8b resp.—exactly linear
ksh/ksh, 26,6b and 9a resp.!—linear
‘l, 26,7a+b.10a—linear; see also *‘l* in 26,9b
pršz/šprh, 26,9b and 13a resp.—alliteration

11.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

25,2–3.26,5–7: *h-* beginning line, 25,2a+3a.26,5a—exactly linear
pḥd/ḥyl, 25,2a and 26,5a resp.—linear; see Job 15,20–21
l-, 25,3a.26,6b
‘l, 25,3b.26,7a+b—linear

25,4–6.26,8–10: *‘m*, 25,4a.26,10b
‘d, 25,5a.26,10b!

26,2–4.11–13: *kḥ*, 26,2a.12a!
ḥkmh/tbwnh, 26,3a and 12b resp.—linear
nšmh/rwḥ, 26,4b and 13a resp.—linear

25,2–26,4.26,14: *my*, 25,3b+26,4a+b.26,14c!
wmh, 25,4a+b.26,14b; see also *mh* in 26,2–3
hn, 25,5a.26,14a!
mlyn/dbr, 26,4a and 14b resp.!
wnšmt/nšm‘ 26,4b and 14b resp.—alliteration

26,2–4.5–7, concatenatio: *ngd/ngd*, vv. 26,4a and 6a resp.
mn, 26,4b.5b

26,11–13.14, concatenatio: *kḥ/gbwrh*, 26,12a and 14c resp.
byn, 26,12b.14c!

11.4.5 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

11.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration
b-, *-w*, *l’* (26,8), *mh* (26,7)

11.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration
’wr

11.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 25,2–4.5–6 (3.2); 26,2–4|5–7.8–10.11–13.14 (3|3.3.3.1); similarly Hitzig (1874)
Stickel (1842): 25,2–6 (5); 26,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14 (4×3|1)
Schlottmann (1851): 25,2.3–4.5–6 (1.2.2); 26,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14 (4×3.1)
Ewald (1854): 25,2–6; 26,2–4|5–7.8–10.11–13.14 (3|3×3.1); cf. KBS (1980)
Merx (1871): 25,2–4.5–6 (6.4); 26,2–4.5–6.7–9.10–11.12–13.14* (6.4.6.3×4)
Delitzsch (1876): 25,2–6 (10); 26,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14 (4×6.3)
Wright (1883): 25,2–3.4–6 (4.6); 26,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14 (4×6.3)
Dillmann (1891): 25,2–4.5–6 (6.4); 26,2–4(‘Einleitung’).5–7.8–10.11–13.14 (4×6.3)
Bickell (1894): 25,2–3.26,12–13.14c*+25,4.5–6 (Bildad); 26,2+4.27,2+4...
Ley (1895): 25,2–6.24,18–20+27,13.14–18.19–23 (4×5); see for ch. 26 Schlottmann

Duhm (1897): 26,2–3.4+25,2.3–4.5–6.26,5-6.7–8.9–10.11-12.13–14 (Bildad); similarly Hölscher (1952)
Vetter (1897): 25,2–3.4–6; 26,2–4|5–6.7–9.10–11.12–14
Hontheim (1904): 15,17–19.25,4–6|26,2–4|5–9.10–14 (3.3|3|5.5; Bildad and Job)
Schlögl (1916): 25,2–6 (10); 26,2–4.5–14 (6.22); cf. König (1929), TOB (1978)
Löhr (1920): 26,2–3a+x.y+3b–4.25,2–3.5–6|26,5–6.10*–11.12–13.14* (4×2|4×2; Bildad)
Peters (1928): 25,2–4.5–6 (3.2); 26,2–4.5–6.7–9.10–11.12–13.14 (3.2.3.2.2.1); cf. Merx (1871)
Kissane (1939): 25,2–6.26,5–9.10–14 (5.5.5; Zophar)
Möller (1955): 25,2.3–4.5–6 (1.2.2); 26,2–3.4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14 (2.1.3.3.3.1)
Skehan (1961): 25,2–3.4–6 (2.3); 26,2–4.5–6.7–9.10–13+27,22.26,14 (3.2.3.5.1); cf. NAB (1970)
Fohrer (1963): 25,2–6 (5); [26,5–9; 10–14 (‘Hymnus’)]
Terrien (1963): 25,2–3.4–6|26,5–6.7–9|10–11.12–14 (Bildad)
Gordis (1978): 25,2.3–6. . . 26,5–6.7–9.10–13.14 (Bildad)
De Wilde (1981): 25,2–3.26,5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.25,4–6 (Bildad); cf. Duhm (1897)
Van Selms (1983): 26,2–6.7–14.25,2–6 (Zophar)
Webster (1983): 25,2–6; 26,2–4.5–9.10–14 (3.5.5)
Rozelaar (1984): 25,2–6.26,5–6.7–9.10–13.14 (Bildad)
Habel (1985): 25,2|3–4.5–6|26,5–6.7–8|9|10–11.12–13|14 (a.b.c.d.c’.a’; Bildad)
Bezuidenhout (1986): 25,2–3.4–6; 26,2–4.5–6|7–10.11–14||. . . (. . . ; 3.2|4.4||. . .)
Hartley (1988): 25,2–6.27,13–23 (Bildad); 26,2–4|5–14|. . .

11.6 Comments and summary

According to MT, we find in ch. 26 Job’s reply to the (short) speech by Bildad in ch. 25 (see the headings in 25,1 and 26,1). But in connection with the attempt to solve the problems of the so-called third cycle of speeches many scholars have taken ch. 26 as the continuation of Bildad’s speech in ch. 25, with the exception of 26,2–4, which unit is usually attributed to Job himself.[1] The hymnic materials relating to God’s creative power and governance, which characterize both chapters, are supposed to point to a coherent whole. And the positive tone of these hymnic materials, if spoken by Job, would be inconsistent with Job's earlier use of hymnic forms.

---

[1] So, among others, E. Reuss (*Hiob*, Braunschweig, 1888), Dhorme, Terrien, Pope, Gordis, De Wilde, Rozelaar and Habel. Kissane assumes that Zophar is speaking here. Duhm, Hölscher and Van Selms do not remove 26,2–4 from its position in MT and take these lines as a reproach by one of the friends!; whereas Van Selms assumes that Zophar

According to Habel, 'a basic coherence of structure and theme is evident' when the two pieces of chs. 25 and 26,5-14 are brought together (p. 366). It is supposed that the declaration of 26,9 (element d; cf. anal. 11.5), in which it is stated that God hides his celestial throne behind his cloud, is the pivotal point of the composition. In my opinion, Habel's thesis about the 'basic coherence of structure and theme' is valid only if 26,2–4 is not removed from its place in MT.[2] Chs. 25 and 26 in their entirety, when brought together, constitute a perfectly complete unit, an individual poem. This poem as a whole deals with God's awesome power and cosmic design. The composition divides into two cantos of relatively equal length, i.e. of eight and nine lines respectively (25,2–26,4 and 26,5–13), and winds up with a mono-line strophe which functions as a conclusion. This strophe falls outside the canto structure proper (26,14).[3] In the first canto (25,2-26,4) God's overwhelming greatness is contrasted to human littleness and weakness (see 25,4–26,4). It is noteworthy that this canto is completely dominated by interrogative sentences; see especially 25,3.4.6 and 26,4.[4] This syntactical form does not occur in 26,5-13. In the concluding strophe (26,14), however, we meet again such an interrogative phrase; see v. 14c. This alternation perfectly fits the overall structure of the poem (see anal. 11.4.4 and cf. also below). The second canto (26,5–13), then, is entirely devoted to the description of God as the creator of the world (see anal. 11.2).

The cantos are primarily built up out of three-line strophes, 25,4–6, 26,2–4, 5–7, 8–10, 11–13.[5] The first strophe is an exception to this regularity with only two lines (25,2–3). These strophes each develop one aspect of the main theme of the successive cantos; see anal. 11.2. For the strophic structure of this poem see further the responsions and inclusions which are

---

is speaking in chs. 25-26 (cf. Kissane). See also Kuhl, *ThR* 21 (1953), p. 278 n. 11. The unit of 26,2–4 is usually connected with the beginning of ch. 27 in order to form a new speech by Job; so, among others, by Dhorme, Fohrer, Terrien, Pope and Habel (see also Rozelaar and cf. Kissane).

[2] The fact that his second structural element (b), 25,3–6, has no counterpart forms another weak point in Habel's design.

[3] For the special character of this concluding strophe see part VI, 1.2.6.

[4] That is to say each strophe in this canto is rounded off by an interrogative line; for the strophic structure see below. I owe this observation to the perceptivity of two former students of mine, Doetie Visser and Bertina de Vries (Dokkum, 12.4.91).

[5] For the three-line strophes in ch. 26 see also Köster, Stickel, Schlottmann, Ewald, Hitzig, Delitzsch, Wright, Dillmann in anal. 11.5 (cf. Möller); for 25,2–3.4–6 see Skehan and Terrien.

described in anal. 11.4.2–3. The three-line strophe of 25,4–6 is a variation of the three-line strophes we come across in the first and the second speech of Eliphaz (see 4,17–19 and 15,14–16). The strophe of 25,4–6 displays several pecularities which make the unit fit the context of this specific poem; note the repetition of *mh* ('what?') in 25,4 (cf. anal. 11.4.3), *'m* ('with') in 25,4a (cf. anal. 11.4.3), the inclusio by *'nwš* ('man') in 25,4–6 (cf. *mym* in 26,8–10 and *šmym* in 26,11–13). Analysis 11.5 shows that contemporary scholarship generally takes 26,5–6 as a close unit and combines v. 7 with the following lines (note Vetter, Peters, Skehan, Terrien, Rozelaar, Habel).[6] From a formal point of view this division does no justice to the repeated pattern of inclusio which (also) determines the strophes 26,8–10 and 11–13 (cf. above and anal. 11.4.2). See also the linear, verbal repetitions *mtḥt/tḥtm*, *ksh/ksh*, *'l* in anal. 11.4.3. The noun *thw* ('void') in 26,7a and the expression *bly mh* ('emptiness') in 26,7b allude to the forces of uncreation (cf. Gen. 1,2) and therefore belong with the *rp'ym* and the *š'wl* in the preceding lines (vv. 5–6).[7] The inclusions in 26,8–10 and 11–13 suggest that the quintessential thought of these strophes is to be found in the central lines, 26,9 and 26,12. According to v. 9 God *hides* his throne. This idea corresponds now with the central line of the preceding strophe: the underworld has *no cover* (26,6). See also *ksh/ksh* in the lines concerned.[8] 26,9 also constitutes the pivotal line of the second canto; cf. Habel's design. The pivotal character of the line is enhanced by the inclusio *yḥwllw/ḥllh* in 26,5.13 (anal. 11.4.3). In this context we may assume, I think, that the central line of canto I (25,5) also represents its pivotal idea: even the celestial bodies are unclean before God. Note *hn* at the beginning of the line and the inclusio by *'nwš* in 25,4–6 (already referred to above). Finally, as far as the strophic structure of chs. 25–26 is concerned, it is striking that the beginning of the concluding strophe (26,14) should display a whole cluster of transition markers; see anal. 11.3.1.1. From the perspective of the verbal repetitions there is a special relationship with the first canto; see anal. 11.4.4 and note *my* ('who?').

From a thematic point of view, we can observe that cantos I–II as a whole (25,2–26,13) display two different patterns, a symmetric pattern and a linear one. The *symmetric pattern* comes to light when we take into consideration the motif of *place*. In canto I, as far as 'place' is concerned, there is a movement from God’s heavenly abode (25,2–3), via the position of man before the almighty God (25,4–6), to the relationship of men among themselves (26,2–4; note Job’s weakness and the irrelevant talking of his friends). In canto II, as far as place is concerned, the movement is opposite, namely upwards. The respective strophes of this second canto describe God’s dominion in the universe as a whole, starting with the realm beneath the earth (26,5–7; note *š’wl*), via the realm of the firmament (26,8–10; note *mym*), to the heavenly realm (26,11–13; note *šmym*).

---

[6] See also J.C. Greenfield, 'The "Cluster" in Biblical Poetry', *Maarav* 5–6 (1990), pp. 159–68 (note p. 161 about the 'cluster' *ṣpwn/ṣrr* in 26,7–8); but cf. M. Dietrich—O. Loretz, *UF* 22 (1990), pp. 79–86.

[7] About *ṣpwn* in 26,7a cf. J.J.M. Roberts, *Biblica* 56 (1975), pp. 554–57.

[8] The correspondence already suggests that 26,6 also represents a main idea; about the quintessential thought of the whole poem see further below.

At the same time, the successive strophes of canto I, when compared from a thematic point of view with the successive strophes of canto II, also constitute a *linear parallelism.* When we take into consideration the motif of God’s *power and holiness*, we can observe that the content of the three strophes of canto I corresponds with that of the three strophes of canto II in a linear way. The first strophe of canto I portrays God’s fearsome dominion in the heavens (*bmrwmym*, 25,2b), where the ‘stars’ (*gdwdym*, 25,3a) and the ‘sun’ (*’wr*, 25,3b) are vehicles to maintain his control. Habel rightly points out the parallel relationship between 25,2–3 and 26,5–6: ’Just as the heavens are controlled by God . . . , so too the underworld is overwhelmed by his awesome presence’ (p. 370); cf. Löhr (1920, p. 111). So, the opening strophes of cantos I and II, describe *God’s dominion* in the realm above and beneath the earth. In this context we also have to interpret *’wr* in 25,3b (see anal. 11.1). It is God’s *light* which penetrates Sheol as a forbidden place. The root *qwm* in 25,3b is used with the preposition *‘l.* This combination may have a hostile meaning.[9] That is to say the light of God will conquer (25,3) the shades of the underworld (26,6). The second strophe of canto I (25,4–6) affirms the futility of mankind. A human being is identified with a ’maggot’ and a ’worm’ (25,6). Such a creature can never be found innocent and pure before this mighty God (cf. 25,2–3). The proper meaning of the second strophe of canto II (26,8–10) cannot be grasped without its relationship with the parallel strophe of the first canto. The essence of this doxology is found in the core of the strophe, v. 9: there is a cloud to hide God’s throne (cf. above). Thus, the strophe intends to emphasize God’s transcendent holiness and glory against the background of human littleness (cf. 25,4–6). The cloud veils God’s presence to hide his face from unclean mortals (cf. Exod. 19,9; 24,16; Deut. 5,22). This interpretation matches the reading of the Targum in 26,9: ‘He keeps his throne in thick darkness so that the angels will not see Him’. The final strophes of the cantos (26,2–4 and 11–13) form an antithetic parallelism which in a characteristic way winds up the composition. Empty human talk, as it is ironically described in 26,2–4, eventually leaves a man alone without strength and wisdom in a situation of utter distress. On the other hand, God's subjugation of the primordial chaos monsters, by his strength and understanding, creates order in the world (26,11–13).[10]

---

[9] See, e.g., Isa. 14,22 Amos 7,9 Job 19,25.

The pattern of the verbal repetitions and parallel word pairs on the level of the composition as a whole strengthens the semantic, *linear* parallelism between the respective strophes of the first and the second canto of our poem; see anal. 11.4.4. Because a definitely linear pattern can be discovered in the sequence of these verbal connections this analysis does not only point to chs. 25–26 as a self-contained poetic unit, but also to the validity of the canto division. I single out the most obvious features. The first strophe of canto I is marked by the reduplication of *h-* at the very beginning of the lines (25,2a and 3a)—anaphora.[11] This alliteration matches the article *h-* at the very beginning of canto II (26,5a). The noun *pḥd* ('fear') in the first colon of canto I (25,2a) forms a semantic parallelism with the root *ḥyl* (polal 'to be made to tremble') in the first colon of canto II (26,5a); cf. Job 15,20–21. A comparison of the third and the sixth strophe of our poem (26,2–4 and 11–13) reveals that the cantos wind up with an actual cluster of such correspondences. The noun *kḥ* ('power'), which we come across in 26,2a and 12a, does not occur elsewhere in the poem. In the second line of these strophes we find the parallel word pair *ḥkmh* ('wisdom')/*tbwnh* ('understanding'), 26,3a and 12b respectively.[12] The third line of the strophes yields the word pair *nšmh* ('breath')/*rwḥ* ('wind') in 26,4b and 13a respectively.[13]

If the present reconstruction is correct it is to be ruled out that we are dealing with Bildad's third speech. In 26,2–4 the friends are ironically reproached for their miserable comfort (but cf. Duhm, Hölscher and Van Selms). Then we must conclude that the poem is a speech by Job himself.[14]

---

[10] Cf. J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985; and P.E. Dion, 'YHWH as Storm-god and Sun-god', *ZAW* 103 (1991), pp. 43–71 (note p. 54).

[11] *hmšl* (25,2a) is an infinitive absolute hiph'il of *mšl*, used as a noun. In 25,3a we are dealing with the interrogative pronoun *h-*.

[12] For this word pair see Jer. 10,12 Job 12,12.13 Prov. 3,13.19 8,1. Cf. also *ḥkmh // bynh* in Job 28,12.20.28 38,36 39,17 Prov. 1,2 (*ḥkmh // 'mry bynh*) 4,5.7 9,10 16,16 Isa. 11,2 (*rwḥ ḥkmh wbynh*) and the parallelism of the roots *ḥkm* and *byn* in Isa. 3,3 and Job 32,9.

[13] For *nšmh/rwḥ* see Isa. 42,5 Job 4,9 27,3; for *rwḥ/nšmh* Isa. 57,16 Job 32,8 33,4. Cf. also *rwḥw wnšmtw* in Job 34,14, *nšmt rwḥ* in Gen. 7,22 2 Sam. 22,16 and Ps. 18,16—collocation. In Job 37,10.21 and Isa. 30,28.33 the nouns in question also form a distant parallelism!

[14] This outcome is furthermore supported by the following observations. The first colon of 25,4 (*wmh yṣdq 'nwš 'm 'l*) is a verbal 'quotation' of 9,2b (Job). In the preceding

The singular verb forms do not exclude this interpretation; see 16,3.

The *main theme* of the poem is formulated in the first strophes of the cantos (25,2–3 and 26,5–7), I think. God rules the heavens and the underworld. In the context of the framework of the speech-cycles the first strophe of canto II (26,5–7) most explicitly contains the quintessential thought of the poem; note the central line: *the underworld has no cover.* Within the rhetorical framework of this hymn on God's creative power (note 26,11–13) Job concludes that God's battle against the forces of chaos does not end before the gates of the underworld. God's *light* (cf. the parallel strophe 25,2–3) will also penetrate the realm which Job sees as his actual future.[15]

The poem makes it clear that the discussion with the friends is sidetracked. The friends are directly addressed in 26,2–4. This address, however, is masterly woven into and connected with the hymn on God's creative power. From a thematic point of view the poem can be seen as a working-out and logical sequel of Job's speech in ch. 23. A human being cannot approach God because he hides Himself from unclean mortals (note 23,8–9 and 26,9). On the other hand, such a creature will not escape the attention of this transcendent God, even when he is staying in Sheol. Though, there are also verbal connections with the preceding speech 'by Bildad' in ch. 24, some of which point to a deliberate repetition. Cf., e.g., *yqwm* in 25,3 with 14,14.22, *'wr* in 25,3 and 26,10 with 24,13.14.16, *'ynyw* in 25,5 with 24,23 (and 15), *'rwm* in 26,6 with 24,7.10 (!), *w'yn kswt* in 26,6 with 24,7 (!), *nṭh* in 26,7 with 24,4, *bly* in 26,7 with 24,6.7.8.10, *ḥšk* in 26,10 with 24,16, *bkḥw* in 26,12 with 24,22 (see also *kḥ* in 26,2), *drk* in 26,14 with 24,4 etc.

---

speeches the expression *bn 'dm* (25,6b) only occurs in 16,21 (Job; but cf. also BHS); see further 35,8 (Elihu). In the preceding speeches the word pair *ḥkmh/tbwnh* only occurs in 12,12 and 13 (cf. above; again Job).

[15] For the significance of this idea within the logical structure of chs. 3–26 see part VII, 1.2.2.

12 God’s closing comment and Job’s reaction: Job 40,1–5

Structure: 1 2

[2] *hrb ‘m šdy yswr* *mwkyḥ ’lwh y‘nnh*

[4] *hn qlty mh ’šybk* *ydy śmty lmw py*
[5] *’ḥt dbrty wl’ ’‘nh* *wštym wl’ ’wsyp*

12.1 Text

V. 2a—*yswr*: hapax legomenon (cf. Andersen).

12.2 Content

God’s comment: do you want to contend with me? (v. 2).
Job’s reaction: I am of small worth, how can I answer You (vv. 4–5).

12.3 Transition markers

12.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

12.3.1.1 *h*- interr., v. 2a
hn, v. 4a
mh, v. 4a

12.3.1.2 no remarks

12.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

12.3.2.1 no remarks

12.3.2.2 no remarks

12.3.3 Contrary indications

no remarks

12.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

12.4.1 Within the strophes

vv. 4–5: *śmty/štym*, vv. 4b and 5b resp.—alliter. (linear)
lmw py/wl’ ’wsyp, vv. 4b and 5b resp.—alliter. (linear)

12.4.2 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–5: *ʿnh*, vv. 2b.5a—inclusio

12.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): cf. part IV, 7.5; similarly Schlottmann (1851), Ley (1895), TOB (1978), Hartley (1988)
Merx (1871): 2|4–5|... (2|4|...)
Delitzsch (1876): ...|2.4–5 (...|2.4); cf. Merx (1871)
Bickell (1894): see part IV, 8.5 and 9.5; similarly Duhm (1897), Fohrer (1963), De Wilde (1981)
Hontheim (1904): see part IV, 9.5
Löhr (1918): cf. part IV, 9.5
Kissane (1939): cf. part IV, 8.5
Van Selms (1982): ...40,1–5; similarly Habel (1985)

12.6 Comments

For 40,1–5 as closing section of cycle II see part VII, 2.5.2.

PART IV

The Third Speech-Cycle
(Job 27–31 and 38–41)
and Job 42,1–6

1 Job’s final reply to his friends (1): Job 27

Structure: 12.10 > 6.6|10 > 3.3|3.3||2.2.2.2.2

I.1	2	*ḥy ’l* HSYR *mšpṭy*	*wšdy hmr* **npšy**
	3	**ky** *kl ‘wd nšmty by*	*wrwḥ ’lwh b’py*
	4	**’m** *tdbrnh śpty* ‘WLH	*wlšwny* **’m** *yhgh rmyh*
	5	*ḥlylh ly ’m ’ṢDYQ* **’tkm**	*‘d ’gw‘* **l’** ’SYR *tmty mmny*
	6	*bṢDQTy hḥzqty wl*’ *’rph*	**l’** *yḥrp lbby mymy*
	7	*yhy k***rš‘** *’yby*	*wmtqwmmy k*‘WL
I.2	8	**ky** *mh tqwt ḥnp* **ky** *ybṣ‘*	**ky** *yšl ’lwh* **npš***w*
	9	*hṣ‘qtw yšm‘ ’l*	**ky** *tbw’ ‘lyw ṣrh*
	10	**’m** *‘l šdy yt‘ng*	*yqr’ ’lwh bkl ‘t*
	11	*’wrh* **’tkm** *bYD ’l*	*’šr ‘m šdy* **l’** *’kḥd*
	12	*hn ’tm klkm ḥzytm*	*wlmh zh hbl thblw*
	13	*zh ḥlq ’dm* **rš‘** *‘m ’l*	*wnḥlt ‘ryṣym mšdy yqḥw*
II	14	**’m** *yrbw bnyw lmw ḥrb*	*wṣ’ṣ’yw l’ yśb‘w lḥm*
	15	*śrydw bmwt yqbrw*	*w’lmntyw l’ tbkynh*

[16] **’m** *yṣbr k‘pr ksp*   *wkḥmr ykyn mlbwš*
[17] *ykyn wṢDYQ ylbš*   *wksp nqy yḥlq*

[18] *bnh k‘š bytw*   *wkskh ‘śh nṣr*
[19] *‘šyr yškb wl’ y’sp*   *‘ynyw pqḥ w’ynnw*

[20] *tśyghw kmym blhwt*   *lylh gnbtw swph*
[21] *yś’hw qdym wylk*   *wyś‘rhw* **mmqmw**

[22] *wyšlk ‘lyw wl’ yḥml*   *mYDw brwḥ ybrḥ*
[23] *yśpq ‘lymw kpymw*   *wyšrq ‘lyw* **mmqmw**

1.1 Text

V. 5: the masoretic accentuation suggests that we are dealing with two bicola (cf., e.g., 7,20 and 21), or a tricolon. The strophic structure of canto I (three-line strophes) makes it clear that the verse represents *one* line only, like all the other verses in this poem (see also Gordis).

V. 6b—*l’ yḥrp lbby*: ‘Meaning of Heb. uncertain’ (NJPS).

V. 8b—*yšl*: = *yš’l*; so Schnurrer (1781), Kroeze, Van Selms, among others (cf. Lk. 12,20 and Gordis).

V. 15a—*śrydw*: so K; Q *śrydyw*.

V. 18a—*‘š*: ‘moth’, but also ‘night watchman’; so Habel, following Pope.

V. 19a—*y’sp*: ‘he will be gathered’; so MT. I follow LXX and read the verb as a variant of *ywsyp* (‘he does again’); with Habel (see also Ewald, Fohrer, Kroeze, Gordis).

V. 22a—*wyšlk*: the overall structure of the poem indicates that the subject is not ‘the east wind’ (v. 21a; so RSV, Pope, Fohrer, Gordis, NJPS, Van Selms, Habel, Hartley), but God himself; cf. *byd ’l*/*mydw* in vv. 11a and 22b resp. (see anal. 1.6; so NBG, Kroeze, Andersen).

v. 23a—*‘lymw*: = *‘lyw*; cf. 20,23 and 22,2.

1.2 Content

Job accuses his friends of being his enemies.

I Job holds on to his righteousness and innocence.
  I.1 Job holds on to his righteousness.
      As long as I live I will not tell a falsehood (vv. 2–4).
      I hold on to my righteousness (vv. 5–7).
  I.2 There is no hope for the wicked.
      There is no hope for the wicked (vv. 8–10).
      I will enlighten you on God’s actions (vv. 11–13).

II Description of the inglorious end of the wicked.
The children of the wicked perish by the sword and from starvation (vv. 14–15).
The righteous shall inherit their wealth (vv. 16–17).
Their abodes and lives are fragile (vv. 18–19).
They are swept away from their homes (vv. 20–21).
They have to flee from God and to endure the derision of people (vv. 22–23).

1.3 Transition markers

1.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

1.3.1.1 *ḥlylh l-*, v. 5a
mh, v. 8a; ext. // *h-* interr. in v. 9a
ḥnp, v. 8a
w- beginning line, v. 22a
jussive: *wyšlk*, v. 22a

1.3.1.2 *tqwh*, v. 8a

1.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

1.3.2.1 *rš‘*, v. 7a
bkl ‘t, v. 10b† (see Psalms)
zh, v. 13a; ext. // with *zh* in v. 12b
rš‘, v. 13a

1.3.2.2 jussive: *yhy*, v. 7a

1.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

hn, v. 12a
’tm, v. 12a
lmh, v. 12b

1.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

1.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’l* (‘God’), vv. 2, 9, 11, 13; *’lwh*, vv. 3, 8, 10; *’m*, vv. 4, 4, 5, 10, 14, 16; *’t*, vv. 5, 11
b: *b-*, vv. 3, 3, 6, 10, 11, 15; *brḥ*, vv. 22, 22
h: *hbl*, vv. 12, 12; *-hw*, vv. 19, 20, 20, 21, 21
w: *-w*, vv. 8, 9, 9, 14, 14, 15, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 22, 23, 23
z: *zh*, vv. 12, 13

ḥ: *ḥlq*, vv. 13, 17

y: *-y*, vv. 2, 2, 3 (3×), 4, 4, 5, 5, 6 (3×), 7, 7; *yd*, vv. 11, 22

k: *k-*, vv. 7, 7, 16, 16, 18, 18, 20; *kwn*, vv. 16, 17; *ky*, vv. 3, 8 (3×), 9; *kl*, vv. 3, 10, 12; *-km*, vv. 5, 11, 12; *ksp*, vv. 16, 17

l: *l-*, vv. 5, 12, 14; *l’*, vv. 5, 6, 6, 11, 14, 15, 19, 22; *lbš*, vv. 16, 17

m: *mh*, vv. 8, 12; *-mw*/*-mw*, vv. 14 and 23 (2×) resp.; *mn*, vv. 5, 6, 13, 21, 22, 23

n: *npš*, vv. 2, 8

s: *swr*, vv. 2, 5

‘: *‘wl*, vv. 4, 7; *‘l*, vv. 9, 10, 22, 23, 23; *‘m* (prep.), vv. 11, 13

ṣ: *ṣdq*, vv. 5, 6, 17

q: *qwm*, vv. 7, 21, 23

r: *rš‘*, vv. 7, 13

š: *šdy*, vv. 2, 10, 11, 13

1.4.2 Within the strophes

vv. 2–4: *’l*/*’lwh*, vv. 2a and 3b resp.; see also *šdy* in v. 2b
mšpṭy/*nšmty*/*śpty*, vv. 2a, 3a and 4a resp. (alliter.)—linear
hmr/*rmyh*, vv. 2b and 4b resp. (alliteration)—inclusio
npšy/*b’py*, vv. 2b and 3b resp.—‘rhyme’

vv. 5–7: *ṣdq*, vv. 5a.6a (Hontheim, p. 214); see also *tmh* in v. 5b
l’, vv. 5b.6a+b
mmny/*mymy*, vv. 5b and 6b resp.—‘rhyme’; see also *wmtqwmmy* in v. 7b—alliteration
mn, vv. 5b.6b—linear

vv. 8–10: *ky*, vv. 8a (2×)+b.9b
’lwh, vv. 8b.10b—inclusio; see also *’l* in v. 9a and *šdy* in v. 10a
-w, vv. 8b.9a+b
‘l, vv. 9b.10a

vv. 11–13: *-km*, vv. 11a.12a—linear
’l // *šdy*, vv. 11.13—inclusio (Hontheim, p. 214)
‘m, vv. 11b.13a!—inclusio
zh, vv. 12b.13a!

vv. 14–15: *-w*//*-w*, vv. 14.15
l’, vv. 14b.15b—linear

vv. 16–17: *ksp*, vv. 16a.17b! } chiasm
ykyn + root *lbš*, vv. 16b.17a!
vv. 18–19: *-w*, vv. 18a.19b
vv. 20–21: *-hw*//*-hw*, vv. 20.21
vv. 22–23: *‘lyw*, vv. 22a.23b; see also *-w* in vv. 22b and 23b, and *‘lymw* in v. 23a
mn, vv. 22b.23b
yd/*kp*, vv. 22b and 23a resp.

1.4.3 Within the canticles

vv. 2–7 (I.1): *ḥy ’l*/*ḥlylh*, vv. 2a and 5a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
swr (hiph‘il), vv. 2a.5b!—linear (Hontheim, p. 214)
špṭ/*ṣdq*, vv. 2a and 5a+6a resp. (linear)
-y, vv. 2–7!
-y ext. // *-y* (‘rhyme’), vv. 2–3.5–6 (exactly linear)
b-, vv. 3a–b.6a—linear
’m, vv. 4a–b.5a—concatenatio
‘wl, vv. 4a.7b!—linear (Hontheim, p. 214)
vv. 8–13 (I.2): *mh*, vv. 8a.12b!
šdy // *’lwh* and *’l* // *šdy*, vv. 10 and 11 resp.—concat. (Hontheim, p. 214)
b-, vv. 10b.11a—concatenatio
kl, vv. 10b.12a

1.4.4 Within the cantos

vv. 2–13 (canto I): *’l*/*’lwh*/*šdy*, vv. 2–13!
npš, vv. 2b.8b!—exactly linear
ky, vv. 3a.8–9!—linear
kl, vv. 3a.10b+12a!
’m, vv. 4a+b.10a—exactly linear; see also *’m* in v. 5a
’tkm, vv. 5a.11a!—linear; see also *-km* in v. 12a!
l’, vv. 5–6.11b—linear
mn, vv. 5b+6b.13b—linear
rš‘, vv. 7a.13a!—linear; see also *‘wl* in v. 7b and *‘ryṣ* in v. 13b

vv. 14–23 (canto II): *’m*, vv. 14a.16a—exactly linear
-mw/*-mw*, vv. 14a and 23a (2×) resp.!—inclusio

k-, vv. 16a+b.18a+b.20a—linear
-hw, vv. 19b.20–21!—concatenatio
mn, vv. 21b.22b+23b—concatenatio
mmqmw, vv. 21b.23b—exactly linear; see also
w'ynnw in v. 19b! (Fokkelman)
-w, vv. 21b.22–23—concatenatio

1.4.5 Within the composition as a whole

vv. 2–7.14–17: *'m*, vv. 4a+b+5a.14a+16a; cf. also *'m* in v. 10a
ṣdq, vv. 5a+6a.17a!—'linear'
k- // k-, vv. 7.16—'linear'

vv. 8–13.18–23: *yd 'l/ydw*, vv. 11a and 22b resp.!—'linear'
mn, vv. 13b.21b+22b+23b
hbl/blhwt, vv. 12b and 20a resp.—alliteration

vv. 2–7.18–23: *wmtqwmmy/mmqmw*, vv. 7b and 21b+23b resp.!—end section

vv. 8–13.14–17: *ḥlq*, vv. 13a.17b!—end section

1.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

1.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
b- (v. 15), *l'*

1.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*brḥ*), (*hbl*), *l-*

1.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13.14–18.19–23||… (4×3.5.5||…); cf. KBS (1980)
Stickel (1842): 2–6.7–10.11–13.14–15|16–19.20–23… (5.4.3.2|4.4…)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–12||13–15.16–18|19–21.22–23||… (3.3|3.2||3.3|3.2||…)
Ewald (1854): 2–4.5–7.8–10|11–13.14–18.19–23|… (3×3|3.5.5|…); cf. Köster (1831) and Dillmann (1891)
Merx (1871): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23… (4×6|5×4…)
Hitzig (1874): 2–6.7–10|11–12.13–15.16-19.20–22.23|…

Delitzsch (1876): 2–7.8–12.13–18.19–23|... (12.10.12.10|...)
Wright (1883): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12|13–15.16–18.19–21.22–23|... (3×6.4|3×6.4|...); cf. Schlottmann (1851)
Bickell (1894): 26,2+4.27,2+4.5–6.11–12.28,1–2.3a+9b+10a+11b.20–21a+22b.23–24.25+27.28* (Job); 27,7–8.9–10.14–15.16–17.18a+19a+20 (Zophar)
Ley (1895): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12*... (4×3...)
Duhm (1897): 2+4.5+3.6 (Job); 7–8.9–10|11+13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23 (Zophar)
Vetter (1897): 2–4.5–6|7–8.9–10|11–12|13–15.16–17.18–19.20+23|...
Hontheim (1904): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13||24,18–20||27,14–15.16–18|19–21.22–23 (3.3|3.3||3||2.3|3.2)
Schlögl (1916): 2–12.13–23 (22.22); cf. Möller (1955)
Peters (1928): 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13.14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23|... (3.3|3.3.5×2|...)
König (1929): 2–6.7–10|11–23
Kissane (1939): 26,2–4.27,11–12+7.8–10.13–15.16–18.19–21.x+22–23 (7×3; Bildad)
Hölscher (1952): 2+4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12 (Job); 14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23 (Zophar)
Skehan (1961): 13–15.16–21 (3.6; Zophar); 11+7–10.2–6+12 (5.6; Job); cf. NAB (1970)
Fohrer (1963): 26,2–4.27,2–6.11–12+x (3.5.2+x); [27,7–10+13.14–18.19–23 ('Weisheitsgedicht')]
Terrien (1963): 26,2–4|27,2–4.5–6|7–10.11–12 (Job); ...(cf. Job 24)|27,13–15.16–17|18–21.22–23 (Zophar)
TOB (1978): 2–6.7–10|11–13.14–23
De Wilde (1981): 7–8.9–10.11+13.24,18b–19.27,14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23 (Zophar)
Van Selms (1982): 2–12 (Job); 24,13–24.27,13–23 (Bildad)
Webster (1983): 2–6.7–11.12–15.16–19.20–23
Habel (1985): 26,2–4.27,2–4.5–6.7–10.11–12 (a.b.c.b'.a'; Job); 13|14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23 (Zophar)
Bezuidenhout (1986): ...||2–4.5–7|8–10.11–12.13–15|16–19.20–23 (...||3.3|3.2.3|4.4)
Hartley (1988): ...||1–6.7–10|11–12 (Job)

1.6 Comments and summary

The content of the opening lines of ch. 27 is quite in accordance with the heading of the chapter, which introduces the poem as a speech by Job.

These lines clearly represent a statement *by Job* concerning his innocence. From v. 13 onwards, however, we come across a description of the fate of the wicked which matches the descriptions given by the friends in chs. 4–24. For that reason quite a few scholars have divided ch. 27 into two parts: vv. 1–12 and 13–23. The second unit (vv. 13–23), then, is usually ascribed to Zophar.[1]

However, from a formal point of view it is very unlikely that ch. 27 should display a main caesura after v. 12 (or after v. 6). As an investigation into the patterns of the verbal repetitions proves vv. 2–13 form an inseparable unit, the first canto of the poem. This unit falls into four 3-line strophes, which constitute two canticles of six lines (vv. 2–7 and 8–13; cf. also anal. 1.2). The strophes in these canticles display obvious verbal correspondences. From this viewpoint vv. 2–4 correspond with vv. 8–10 and vv. 5–7 with vv. 11–13; note anal. 1.4.4 and see especially *rš'* ('wicked man') in vv. 7 and 13! That is to say, canticle I.1 is *linear* parallel with canticle I.2. At first sight it might seem that the wish expressed in v. 7 does not fit the context of the preceding lines.[2] However, my analysis makes it clear that the line is very deliberately placed. The responsio by *rš'* in vv. 7 and 13 is not the only formal indication that supports MT. V. 7 is also firmly embedded within the rhetorical structure of the poem by the suffix *-y* and the noun *'wl* ('unjust'); see anal. 1.4.3. V. 13 is an almost literal repetition of 20,29. The differences between the lines can be explained by the different formal contexts; see for 27,13 *'m* and *'l // šdy* in anal. 1.4.2., and *'l/šdy* in anal. 1.4.4.

This rhetorical framework of vv. 2–13, now, does not support the idea that a major part of the poem must be interpreted as mere traditional forms because the poet of the book of Job in vv. 7–10 (and 13–23) adopted a piece of an older wisdom-psalm meditating on the fate of the wicked.[3]

---

[1] So Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Hölscher, Kroeze (!), Skehan, Fohrer ('Weisheitsgedicht'), Terrien, Gordis, Habel. Bickell took this chapter already from v. 7 onwards as a speech by Zophar (cf. anal. 1.5); so also Duhm and De Wilde (cf. Fohrer). Van Selms and Hartley take vv. 13–23 as a speech by Bildad. See also the overview with H.G. Reventlow, 'Tradition und Redaktion im Hiob 27 im Rahmen der Hiobreden des Abschnittes Hi 24–27', *ZAW* 94 (1982), pp. 281–82.

[2] According to Budde (1913) the verse is out of place in the present context and has to be read after v. 10, because it summarizes the content of vv. 8–10; see also Budde (1882), p. 210.

[3] So H.G. Reventlow, *art. cit.*, pp. 279–93; cf. also Hartley. Reventlow correctly notes that the poet of the book of Job does not think along the straight lines of modern criticism (p. 291). Nevertheless, the interpretation this scholar gives is not satisfactory, I think, because the final outcome harmonizes too little with the preceding speeches by Job. This criticism also concerns the reasoning by Wolfers; see D. Wolfers, 'The speech-cycles in the book of Job', *VT* 43 (1993), pp. 398–99.

Nor should we conclude from the singular *'yb* ('enemy', v. 7a) that Job is pointing to God.[4] In the second strophes of the canticles (vv. 5–7 and 11–13) Job addresses his friends; note *'tkm* ('you') in vv. 5a and 11a.[5] This suggests that with the noun *'yb* Job accuses his former 'friends'. Vv. 5–7, then, contain two complementary ideas. If Job should give in to his partners in dialogue *he* would be a *rš'* (vv. 5–6), now he wishes *them* to experience the misfortunes which they suppose a *rš'* will suffer (v. 7).[6] This interpretation of v. 7 is of crucial importance for the meaning of the chapter in its entirety (see below).

The (formal) approach of the first main part of ch. 27 (vv. 2–7 externally parallel with vv. 8–13) can very well be associated with a thematic analysis of the unit; cf. anal. 1.2. The first canticle is devoted to Job's proclamation of his innocence and righteousness: as long as I live I will not 'say the thing which is not' (vv. 2–4); I stick to my innocence (vv. 5–7). In the second canticle Job expresses his belief that there is no hope for the godless: there is no hope for the wicked when they pray to God out of their distress (vv. 8–10); I will enlighten you on the fate of the wicked (vv. 11–13). Next, the first strophe of canticle I.1 is thematically connected with the first strophe of canticle I.2: Job will not speak injustice (vv. 2–4) because (note *ky* in v. 8a) it is his conviction that there will be no future for the wicked (vv. 8–10). In the same way the second strophe of canticle I.1 matches the second strophe of canticle I.2: Job wants his 'enemy' to experience the misfortunes of the 'the wicked' (v. 7), for that reason he will lecture his partners in dialogue on the fate of such people (vv. 11–13). And in v. 12a Job reminds his friends of the fact that he has always been a righteous man (vv. 5–6) and subsequently points out that in this perspective their insinuations appear to be nonsense (v. 12b).[7]

---

[4] So rightly Van Selms; against Habel.

[5] According to Habel's design vv. 11–12 correspond with 26,2–4 ('two brief units addressed to the friends'), and vv. 5–6 are supposed to constitute the pivotal passage, Job's 'forceful testimony *before the court*' (p. 377; italics are mine, PvdL). It is clear that this design does no justice to *'tkm* in v. 5a and overlooks the obvious correspondence between vv. 11–12(/13) and 5–6(/7).

[6] So Budde, Peters, Weiser, Andersen. See also Steuernagel, Rozelaar, W. Vogels, *Job* (Belichting van het Bijbelboek), KBS, 1989; and cf. Schlottmann, Regnier (1924), and Möller (p. 63). This interpretation of the second part of ch. 27, according to Gordis, goes back as far as Schultens (1773). In this connection Budde spoke of a 'Rollenaustausch'; Budde (1882), p. 211 (cf. also Weiser).

[7] This analysis confirms the strophic delimitation already proposed by Köster; so also Ewald, Merx, Dillmann, Hontheim, Peters (anal. 1.5). Note further the description of the verbal correspondences by Hontheim (p. 214; cf. anal. 1.4.2–3). The strophe of vv. 11–13 displays a remarkable concentric framework. See the inclusions described in anal. 1.4.2 and note the transition markers *hn*, *'tm* and *lmh* in the central line, v. 12 (see anal.

The poem as a whole falls into two sections with a main break between vv. 13 and 14 (so also Merx). In the first canto Job sets his own innocence (vv. 2–4 and 8–10) against the guilt of his former friends (vv. 5–7 and 11–13). The second canto of the poem, then, immediately links up with the last line of canto I (v. 13), and is only an elaborated portrayal of the heritage the ruthless will receive from the Almighty, the heritage Job wishes on his former partners in dialogue. In this way both cantos of ch. 27 are inseparably connected with each other. This is also confirmed by the repetition of the noun *yd* ('hand'). We find this noun in the last strophes of the cantos only; see vv. 11a and 22b (anal. 1.4.5). Job will advise his friends about 'the hand of God' (v. 11a); and it is this 'hand' from which the wicked man desperately tries to flee (v. 22b). We are dealing here with a refrain-like idea at the end of the cantos of ch. 27. See also *ṣdq* ('to be in the right') in anal. 1.4.5.

The second canto is entirely composed of two-line strophes. See for this strophic interpretation analyses 1.2 and 1.4.2–3; note also *wyšlk* in anal. 1.3.1.1.[8]

I conclude that ch. 27 forms a close unit of structure and content, a complete poem. This poem can only come from Job. In this context the portrayal of the ultimate fate of the ruthless (vv. 14–23) cannot mean that Job drops his former claim to righteousness and yields to the accusation of his 'friends', whose statements with regard to the fate of the wicked had to prove Job's guilt (as against Dillmann). This interpretation of 27,14–23 is excluded by the first canto where Job affirms his righteousness and innocence. The *main theme* of the poem, I think, is to be found in the second strophes of canticles I.1 and I.2, vv. 5-7 and 11–13: *Job accuses his partners in dialogue of being wicked people.*[9]

The main theme of ch. 27 does not directly link up with Job's preceding hymn in (chs. 25–26). Nevertheless, there is a formal relationship between the two poems. The final strophe of ch. 27 links up with the end of Job's preceding speech in chs. 25–26; see *mydw brwḥ ybrḥ* in 27,22b and *brwḥw* ... *ydw* ... *bryḥ* in 26,13. Note also *nšmh/rwḥ* in 27,3 and chs. 25–26 (26,4 and 13).

1.3.3); cf. 25,4–6 (see part III, 11.6).

[8] For the strophic structure of the whole poem see Merx and Peters in anal. 1.5; for the strophic structure of vv. 14–23 see further Duhm, Hölscher, De Wilde and Habel.

[9] For the meaning of this accusation within the framework of the speech-cycles in their entirety see Part VII, 2.4.

3 Job’s final reply to his friends (2): Job 28

Structure: 4.8.8.8 > 4|4.4|4.4|4.4 > 2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2

I	[1] *ky yš lKSP MWṢ’*	*wMQWM lZHB yzqw*	
	[2] *brzl m‘PR yqḥ*	*w’BN yṣwq nḥwšh*	
	[3] *QṢ śm lḥšk*	*wlkl tklyt hw’ ḥwqr*	*’BN ’pl wṣlmwt*
	[4] *prṣ nḥl m‘m gr*	*hnškḥym mny rgl*	*dlw m’NWŠ n‘w*

II.1	[5] *’RṢ mmnh YṢ’ lḥm*	*wTḤTYH* **nhpk** *kmw ’š*
	[6] *MQWM SPYR ’BNYh*	*w‘PRT ZHB lw*
	[7] *ntyb l’ YD‘W ‘yṭ*	*wl’ šzptw ‘yn ’yh*
	[8] *l’ hdrykhw bny šḥṣ*	*l’ ‘dh ‘lyw šḥl*
II.2	[9] *bḥlmyš šlḥ ydw*	**hpk** *mšrš hrym*
	[10] *bṣwrwt y’rym bq‘*	*wkl yqr r’th ‘ynw*
	[11] *mbky nhrwt ḥbš*	*wt‘lmh* **yṣ’** *’wr*
	[12] *WHḤKMH M’YN TMṢ’*	*W’Y ZH MQWM BYNH*

III.1	[13] **l’** *YD‘ ’NWŠ* **‘rk***h*	*w***l’** *tmṣ’ b’RṢ hḤYYM*
	[14] *thwm ’MR* **l’** *by hy’*	*wym ’MR ’yn ‘mdy*
	[15] **l’** *ytn sgwr TḤTYH*	*w***l’** *yšql KSP mḥyrh*
	[16] **l’ tslh bktm** *’wpyr*	*bšhm yqr wSPYR*
III.2	[17] L’ Y‘RKNH *zhb wzkwkyt*	*wtmwrth kly pz*
	[18] *r’mwt wgbyš* **l’** *yzkyr*	*wmšk ḤKMH mpnynym*
	[19] L’ Y‘RKNH *pṭdt kwš*	**bktm** *ṭhwr* **l’ tslh**
	[20] *WHḤKMH M’YN TBW’*	*W’Y ZH MQWM BYNH*

IV.1	[21] *wn‘lmh m‘yny* KL *ḤY*	*wm‘wp* HŠMYM *nstrh*
	[22] *’bdwn wmwt ’MRW*	*b’znynw šm‘nw šm‘h*
	[23] *’lhym* **hbyn** *drkh*	*whw’ YD‘ ’t MQWMh*
	[24] *ky hw’ lQṢWT h’RṢ ybyṭ*	*TḤT* KL HŠMYM **yr’h**

IV.2	25	*l'śwt lrwḥ mšql*	*wmym* TKN *bmdh*	
	26	*b'śtw lmṭr ḥq*	*wdrk lḥzyz qlwt*	
	27		*'z* **r'h** *wysprh*	HKYN*h wgm ḥqrh*
	28	*wy'mr l'dm*	*hn yr't 'dny hy' ḤKMH*	*wswr mr' BYNH*

3.1 Text

Vv. 3–4: according to the masoretic accentuation these verses represent two tricola (see also v. 28). Although the translation of v. 4 especially causes difficulties (see Geller, n. 9 [p. 178]), there are no compelling reasons to deviate from this tradition; see also M.B. Dick, *VT* 29 (1979), pp. 216–21 (esp. p. 219 n. 3). Against Condamin (p. 203), Kissane, Pope and Gordis, who take vv. 3–4 as three bicola; cf. Fohrer.

V. 11a—*mbky*: st. c. pl. of *mbk*, 'watery source, spring'; cf. Ugaritic *mbk nhrm* (so Pope, Blommerde, Gordis, De Wilde, Habel, Hartley). According to the vocalization of MT 'from weeping'.

V. 11a—*ḥbš*: a dialectical variation of *ḥpš*, 'to search' (so Pope, Blommerde, Hartley; and cf. De Wilde).

V. 13a—*'rkh*: 'its price'; so MT. Usually one reads *drkh* ('its way'), in accordance with LXX. Although the immediate context (vv. 13–14) appears to favour this reading, I prefer (with Delitzsch, Andersen, Gordis, Pope, Van Selms, and others) to give priority to MT. The root *'rk* binds canticles III.1 and III.2 together (see analysis 2.4.4); 'literary form must speak louder than any other evidence here' (against Geller, n. 21 [p. 181]).

3.2 Content

The quest for wisdom.

I Introduction: man forces his way into all the secret places of the earth.

One can find all sorts of precious metals in the earth (vv. 1–2).

Man explores all the remote corners of the world (vv. 3–4).

II Formulation of the problem (exposition): man forces his way into all the secret places of the earth, but fails to find wisdom.

II.1 The earth contains treasures that remain hidden even to animals.

The earth conceals a wealth of powers and riches (vv. 5–6);

even the mighty animals are unable to attain these treasures (vv. 7–8).

II.2 Man is able to reach these treasures, but fails to find wisdom.
Man digs tunnels in the earth in search of wealth (vv. 9–10);
in this way he brings to light what was hidden, but wisdom remains concealed (vv. 11–12).
III Deepening of the problems: wisdom is unattainable for mankind.
III.1 Wisdom is not to be obtained by man on earth.
Nowhere on earth is man able to find wisdom (vv. 13–14).
Wisdom is not for sale for all the wealth in the world (vv. 15–16).
III.2 Nor can wisdom be compared with anything else on earth.
Wisdom cannot be compared with any earthly treasure (vv. 17–18).
If wisdom cannot be compared with any earthly wealth, where does wisdom come from? (vv. 19–20).
IV Dénouement: Only God knows the place of wisdom.
IV.1 Only God knows the place of wisdom.
The living are unable to discover wisdom; even death has only some understanding of it (vv. 21–22).
God only knows where wisdom can be found (vv. 23–24).
IV.2 God himself gave wisdom a place in his creation.
When God set a limit to the forces of nature (vv. 25–26),
He also decided in which way human beings could share in wisdom: by fearing the LORD (vv. 27–28).

3.3 Transition markers

3.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

2.3.1.1 *hw'*, v. 3b
'nwš, v. 13a
w- beginning line, v. 21a
hw', v. 23b; ext. // *hw'* in v. 24a
'z, v. 27a

2.3.1.2 no remarks

3.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

2.3.2.1 *zh*, v. 12b
'mr, v. 14a
hy', v. 14a
'mr, v. 14b

zh, v. 20b
’mr, v. 22a
’mr, v. 28a
hy’, v. 28b

2.3.2.2 *’nwš*, v. 4c
w- beginning line, v. 12a

m’yn, v. 12a
’y, v. 12b
w- beginning line, v. 20a
m’yn, v. 20a
’y, v. 20b
w- beginning line, v. 28a
hn, v. 28b

3.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

gm, v. 27b

3.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

3.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’bn*, vv. 2, 3, 6; *’y*, vv. 12, 20; *’yn*, vv. 12, 14, 20; *’mr*, vv. 14, 14, 22, 28; *’nwš*, vv. 4, 13; *’rṣ*, vv. 5, 13, 24

b: *b*-, vv. 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 16, 19, 22, 26; *byn*, vv. 12, 20, 23, 28

d: *drk*, vv. 8, 23, 26

h: *h*- (article), vv. 4, 12, 13, 20, 21, 24, 24; -*h*, vv. 5, 5, 6, 13, 15, 15, 17, 17, 19, 22, 23, 23, 27 (4×); *hw’*, vv. 3, 23, 24; *hy’*, vv. 14, 28; *hpk*, vv. 5, 9

w: -*w*, vv. 6, 7, 7, 8, 9, 10

z: *zh*, vv. 12, 20; *zhb*, vv. 1, 6, 17

ḥ: *ḥyh*, vv. 13, 21; *ḥkmh*, vv. 12, 18, 20, 28; *ḥqr*, vv. 3, 27

y: -*y*, vv. 14, 14; *yd‘*, vv. 7, 13, 23; *yṣ’*, vv. 1, 5, 11; *yqr*, vv. 10, 16

k: *kwn*, vv. 25, 27; *ky*, vv. 1, 24; *kl*, vv. 3, 10, 21, 24; *ksp*, vv. 1, 15; *ktm*, vv. 16, 19

l: *l*-, vv. 1, 1, 3, 3, 6, 24, 25, 25, 26, 26, 28; *l’*, vv. 7, 7, 8, 8, 13, 13, 14, 15, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 19

m: *mn*, vv. 2, 4 (3×), 5, 9, 12, 18, 20, 21, 21, 28; *mṣ’*, vv. 12, 13

s: *slh*, vv. 16, 19; *spyr*, vv. 6, 16

‘: *‘yn*, vv. 7, 10, 21; *‘lm*, vv. 11, 21; *‘m*/*‘md*, vv. 4 and 14 resp.; *‘pr*, vv. 2, 6; *‘rk*, vv. 13, 17, 19; *‘śh*, vv. 25, 26

q: *qwm*, vv. 1, 6, 12, 20, 23; *qṣ*, vv. 3, 24

r: *r’h*, vv. 10, 24, 27

š: *šmym*, vv. 21, 24; *šm‘*, vv. 22, 22; *šql*, vv. 15, 25

t: *tḥt*, vv. 5, 15, 24

3.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 1–2: *ksp … zhb/brzl … nḥwšh*, vv. 1 and 2 resp. (Geller, p. 157)
alliteration; note m/n, k/q, s/z/ṣ sounds (Geller, p. 157)
vv. 3–4: *lḥšk/hnškḥym*, vv. 3a and 4b resp.—alliteration
vv. 5–6: -*h*, vv. 5a+b.6a
vv. 7–8: *l'*, vv. 7a+b.8a+b (Geller, p. 163)
vv. 9–10: *b*-, vv. 9a.10a—exactly linear
ḥlmyš/ṣwr, vv. 9a and 10a resp. (Geller, p. 164)
vv. 13–14: *b*-, vv. 13b.14a
vv. 23–24: *hw'*, vv. 23b.24a
vv. 25–26: *'śwt l-/'śtw l-*, vv. 25a and 26a resp.!—exactly linear; see also *l*- in vv. 25a and 26b

3.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 17–20 (III.2): *l' y'rknh*, vv. 17a.19a—exactly linear
ḥkmh, vv. 18b.20a—linear
vv. 21–24 (IV.1): *kl*, vv. 21a.24b—inclusio
hšmym, vv. 21b.24b!—inclusio; see also *h*- in v. 24a
-*h*, vv. 22b.23a+b—concatenatio
vv. 25–28 (IV.2): *kwn*, vv. 25b.27b!—linear

3.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–4 (canto I): *l*-, vv. 1a+b.3a+b—linear
'bn, vv. 2b.3c—concatenatio
w'bn yṣwq nḥwšh/qṣ śm lḥšk, vv. 2b and 3a resp. (alliter.)—concatenatio (Geller, p. 158)

vv. 5–12 (canto II): *hpk*, vv. 5b.9b!—linear
yṣ' … mqwm, vv. 5–6.11–12—inclusio
l' 'dh 'lyw šḥl/bḥlmyš šlḥ ydw, vv. 8b and 9a resp. (chiastic alliter.)—concatenatio (Geller, p. 164)
'yn, vv. 7b.10b

vv. 13–20 (canto III): *l'*, vv. 13–20
'rk, vv. 13a.17a+19a!—'linear'
-*h*, vv. 13a+15a+b.17a+b+19a—linear
l' tslh bktm/bktm … l' tslh, vv. 16a and 19b resp.!—linear

b-, vv. 16a+b.19b—linear

vv. 21–28 (canto IV): *’mr*, vv. 22a.28a
b-, vv. 22b.26a—linear
drk, vv. 23a.26b
byn, vv. 23a.28c—linear } chiasm
r’h, vv. 24b.27a—linear
l-, vv. 24a.25–26—concatenatio

3.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 1–4.5–8.13-16.21–24: *ky*, vv. 1a.24a!
ksp, vv. 1a.15b!
yṣ’, vv. 1a.5a—linear (Geller, p. 161)
mqwm, vv. 1b.6a.23b (cf. Geller, p. 161)
zhb, vv. 1b.6b—linear (Geller, p. 161)
‘pr, vv. 2a.6b!—linear (Geller, p. 161)
’bn, vv. 2b+3c.6a!
qṣ, vv. 3a.24a!—linear
hw’, vv. 3b.23b+24a!—linear
‘m/‘md, vv. 4a and 14b resp.!
’nwš, vv. 4c.13a!
’rṣ, vv. 5a.13b.24a!
tḥt, vv. 5b.15a.24b!; note *tḥtyh* in vv. 5b and 15a
spyr, vv. 6a.16b!; see also *’wpyr* in v. 16a (alliter.); but cf. *wysprh* in v. 27b (alliter.)
yd‘, vv. 7a.13a.23b!
drk, vv. 8a.23a—linear
ḥyh, vv. 13b.21a!—linear
’mr, vv. 14a+b.22a—linear

vv. 9–12.17–20.25–28: *r’h*, vv. 10b.27a
whḥkmh m’yn tmṣ’/tbw’ // w’y zh mqwm bynh, vv. 12.20—exactly linear
ḥkmh, vv. 12a.18b+20a.28b!
bynh, vv. 12b.20b.28c—exactly linear

vv. 11–12.13–14, concat.: *h-* (article), vv. 12a.13b
tmṣ’, vv. 12a.13b!
’yn, vv. 12a.14b

vv. 19–20.21–22, concat.: *w-* beginning line, vv. 20a.21a
h- (article), vv. 20a.21b
b-, vv. 19b.22b

3.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

2.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
h- (v. 4), *zhb* (v. 17), *kl*, *l-*, *mn*, *‘yn* (v. 21)

2.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
hy’, *-w*, *ḥqr*, (*-y*), *yqr*, *‘lm*, (*šm‘*), *šql*

3.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...||1–3.4–6.7–8.9–11|12–14.15–17.18–19.20–22|23–24.25–26.27–28 (...|3.3.2.3|3.3.2.3|2.2.2)
Stickel (1842): ...1–4.5–8.9–12.13–16.17–20.21–24.25–28 (7×4)
Schlottmann (1851): ...|1–3.4–8.9–11|12–14.15–19.20–22|23–24.25–26.27–28 (...|3.5.3|3.5.3|2.2.2); cf. Köster (1831)
Ewald (1854): ...||1–2.3–5.6–11|12–22|23–25.26–28
Merx (1871): ...1–2|3–4.5–6.7–9.10–11.12–14.15–16.17–19.20–21.22–24.25–26.27–28* (...4|6.4.6.4.6.4.6.4.6.4.6)
Hitzig (1874): ...||1–3.4–9.10–11|12–14.15–16.17a+18–19a|20–22.23–28 (...||11|3.4|3.6)
Delitzsch (1876): ...|1–4.5–8.9–12.13–16.17–20.21–25.26–28 (...|10.4×8.10.6); cf. Stickel (1842)
Wright (1883): ...|1–2+5–6.3–4+7–8.9–11|12–14.15–19|20–22.23–27|28 (...|8.9.6|6.10|6.10|3)
Dillmann (1891): ...|1–11.12–22.23–28 (11.11.6), or ...|1–5.6–11.12–14+21–22.23–28 (...|12.12.10.12); cf. Schlottmann (1851)
Ley (1895): ...1–3.4–11.12–19.20–27.28 (...3.8.8.8.1)
Duhm (1897): refrain.1–2.3–4*.5–6| refrain.7–8.9+10a+11a.10b+11b+24| refrain.13–14.15–16.17–18| refrain.21–22.23+25.26–27 (refr.3×4|refr.3×4|refr.3×4|refr.3×4)
Vetter (1897): ...|1–12.13–20.21–28 (...|12.8.8.)
Hontheim (1904): 1–3b.3c–5|6–8.9–11||12–14.15–17.18–20||21–22.23–24|25–26.27–28 (3.3|3.3||3.3.3||2.2|2.2); similarly Condamin (1933)
Budde (1913): 1–4+7–11.12–14+21–22.23+25–28; cf. Dillmann (1891)
Schlögl (1916): 1–11.12–22.23–28 (22.22.12); cf. Dillmann (1891)
Driver-Gray (1921): 1–11.12–19.20–27; cf. Steuernagel (1923)
Löhr (1926): 1–2+5–8+12.13–18+20.21–25+27 (7.7.6)

Peters (1928): ...|1–2.3–4.5–6|7–8.9–11||12–14.15–17.18–19|20–22||23–24.25–26.27–28 (...|2.2.2|2.3||3.3.2|3||2.2.2)

König (1929): 1–14.15–19.20–28

Condamin (1933), pp. 203–5: 1–3b.3c–5|6–8.9–11||12.13–14.15–17.18–19.20||21–22.23–24|25–26.27–28 (3.3|3.3||1.2.3.2.1||2.2|2.2)

Kissane (1939): 1–4.5–6+9–11.12–13+7–8+14.15–19.20–24.25–28* (6×5)

Hölscher (1952): 1–2.3*.4*.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.21–22.23+25.26–27

Möller (1955), p. 66: 1–11.12–22.23–28 (11.11.6), or 1–14.15–28 (14.14); cf. Schlögl (1916)

Fohrer (1963): refrain+1–3b+4a+c+5–6.refrain+7–11+24.12–18.20–23+25–27 (4×7); cf. Duhm (1897) and Lévêque (1970), p. 596

Terrien (1963): 1–2.3–4.5–8.9–13|14–16.17–19.20–21|22–24.25–27.28

Epping-Nelis (1968): 1–2.3–4.5–8.9–12|13–20|21–28; cf. Delitzsch (1876)

Weiser (1968): 1–11.12–19.20–28; similarly TOB (1978), Niccacci (1981); cf. Gordis (1978) and Hartley (1988)

NAB (1970): 1–2+5–6.12–13+15–18+20–21+7–8+14+22.23–24+3+9–11.25–28

Andersen (1976): 1–11.12.13–19.20.21–27.28; cf. KBS (1980)

De Wilde (1981): 5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24.25–26.27–28 (4×4|4×4|4×4); cf. Hölscher (1952)

Van Selms (1983): refrain+1–11.12–19.20–27.28; cf. Weiser (1968)

Webster (1983): 1–6.7–11|12–14.15–19|20–22.23–28 (6.5|3.5|3.6); cf. Weiser (1968)

Habel (1985): 1–2.3–4|5–6.7–8.9–11|12.13–14.15–19|20–22.23–27.28 (a.b|a’.c.b’|a”.c’.b”|a”’.abc.d); cf. Weiser (1968)

Bezuidenhout (1986): 1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–11||12–14.15–17.18–19.20–22||23–25.26–28 (5×2.3||3.3.2.3||3.3)

Geller (1987): 1–2|3–4.5–6.7–8|9–11||12.13–14.20*–22||23–24.25–27; cf. Möller (1955)

3.6 Comments and summary

When first looking into Job 28 the unsuspecting reader will get the impression that there are no major obstacles to hinder detection of the rhetorical structure of this poem. Because v. 20 is an almost literal repetition of v. 12 the idea that the poet marked the main sections of his composition with a refrain is obvious. However, analysis 2.5 reveals that the repetition of the line involved did not make an important contribution to the understanding of the framework of the poem. And in some cases it even confused scholars.[1] Broadly outlined, with regard to the overall structure of Job 28 we can discern four opinions.

a) *The denial of vv. 12 and 20 as a refrain.* In the historical survey (part I, 1.1), I mentioned Köster's view 'daß der Refrain, dieses leichteste Kennzeichen des Strophenbaues, im Hiob nirgends vorkommt' (Köster, p. IX). At first sight this assertion causes some surprise in the light of Job 28. How does Köster deal with the repeated lines of vv. 12 and 20 in this chapter? Köster divides vv. 1–11, 12–22 and 23–28. That is to say, he encapsulates the repeated lines in the second main part. In this way, his denial of refrains in the book of Job accords with his interpretation of the overall structure of the poem.

Up to present times Köster's division has found support.[2] From a thematic point of view it is possible indeed to be sympathetic to this division. A description of the thematic content creates the impression that Köster's three main parts are relatively self-contained sections. A human being is able to dig up the most hidden treasures from the earth (vv. 1–11); wisdom, however, cannot be found in this way, nor be purchased with earthly treasures (vv. 12–22); only God has access to wisdom, and for man He has defined as wisdom the fear of the LORD (vv. 23–28).[3] Schlottmann furthermore pointed to the 'kunstvolle strophische Ausführung' of ch. 28. That is to say that the corresponding strophes of vv. 1–11 and 12–22 'sich auch in der Untertheilung der Glieder genau entsprechen, während die das Ganze kräftig zusammenschliessende Endstrophe kürzer gefaßt ist' (p. 372; see anal. 2.5).[4] And finally, Schlottmann elaborates the parallelism between vv. 1–11 and 12–22 on the grounds of verbal repetitions and antithetic (and parallel) thought connections as well.[5]

b) *Vv. 12 and 20 as an introductory refrain.* The second caesura in Köster's structural division needs only little shifting to arrive at the following framework for our chapter: vv. 1–11, 12–19, 20–27 (28). As far as I know G.H.B. Wright (1883) was the first to advocate this overall structure. The great difference compared to the interpretation by Köster is clear. Vv. 12 and 20 are elevated now to a real refrain at the beginning of the second and the third main parts. Especially in modern times the division by Wright has found many adherents.[6]

---

[1] After all, the same can be said of other Hebrew poems with a refrain; see STR, pp. 288-91 (on Ps. 62), 302–4 (on Ps. 67), 335–39 (on Ps. 80). Cf. now also P.R. Raabe, *Psalm Structures. A Study of Psalms with Refrains* (JSOTS 104), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

[2] In the previous century Schlottmann, Ewald and Dillmann followed him in this respect. After 1900 we meet the same demarcation in Budde, Schlögl, Peters, Möller and Geller; cf. anal. 2.5.

[3] Cf. Köster (p. 56) and Ewald (p. 255).

[4] See also Köster in anal. 2.5. As far as vv. 23–28 are concerned Ewald defends the same opinion as Schlottmann (Ewald, p. 255).

[5] The same is true for the structural analyses by Dillmann and Peters; see Van der Lugt (1988), pp. 270–72. It is noteworthy, however, that Köster c.s. have nothing to say about the almost literal repetition of a whole poetic line in their second main part (note vv. 12 and 20); see also the criticism by F.W.C. Umbreit, 'Die neuesten Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Hiob', *ThStKr* 13 (1840), p. 231.

In Wright's opinion the second and the third main parts show the same strophic structure: 6.10|6.10 (see anal. 2.5).[7] V. 28 is an independent closing verse. Ley builds on this idea when he disjoins vv. 1–3 from the first main part. According to Ley it is easy to recognize that from v. 4 onwards we meet the actual description of mining (p. 672). Vv. 1–3 constitute 'eine allgemeine Einleitung'. In this way Ley finds three uniform strophes of eight verses (see anal. 2.5). Two years later Duhm went a step further by construing *four* uniform strophes (see anal. 2.5). According to this approach the refrain originally preceded vv. 1 and 7 as well.[8] Fohrer, following in the wake of Duhm, also discerns four uniform strophes. The refrain is to be added before vv. 1 and 7, and then 'umfassen die Strophen gleichmäßig je sieben Langverse' (p. 393).

At present the tendency to connect Wright's macrodivision of this poem with a more or less rigid strophic interpretation has greatly decreased. However, this does not detract from the poetic value which is generally ascribed to the composition. According to Habel 'the intricacy of the integration techniques employed in the construction of this poem renders any ... efforts at rearrangement or *neat strophic division futile*' (p. 393; italics are mine, PvdL).[9]

c) *Vv. 12 and 20 as a closing refrain.* It is instructive to see that Stickel (1842) already advocated a totally different strophic division of Job 28 than did Köster. Stickel divides the poem into seven strophes of four masoretic verses. In two of these strophes the refrain constitutes a closing poetic line, namely in vv. 9–12 and 17–20 (the third and the fifth strophe); see anal. 2.5 and cf. Delitzsch.

This approach of the strophic structure of ch. 28 prepared the way for Vetter's view, which also incorporates v. 28 as a refrain in the overall structure of the composition, vv. 1–12, 13–20, 21–28. 'Diese Gliederung ist durch einen Kehrvers, der V. 12 und 20 als Frage, *V. 28 als Antwort* steht, sichergestellt' (p. 47; italics are mine, PvdL).[10] Vetter's structural approach is in principle shared by De Wilde; cf. anal. 2.5.[11] In the divisions by Löhr and Epping-Nelis, too, the refrain of vv. 12 and 20 has its place at the end of the main parts (cf. also Terrien; see anal. 2.5).

---

[6] See, e.g., RSV, Weiser, TOB, Niccacci, Clark, Van Selms, Webster, Rozelaar, Habel and Hartley; so earlier Driver-Gray and Steuernagel.

[7] Cf. Köster and Schlottmann above, who maintained that the *first* and the second main parts show an identical structure.

[8] See Van der Lugt (1988), pp. 272–73.

[9] Cf. Weiser. See further Van der Lugt (1988), pp. 273–74.

d) *The repetition in vv. 12 and 20 as inclusio.* Lastly I point to the strophic structure which is advocated by Hontheim and Condamin. According to these scholars the repetition in vv. 12 and 20 is not to be understood as a refrain, but as an inclusio. The almost identical lines embrace the 'Zwischenstrophe', vv. 12–20. This section forms a unity on the basis of its content: 'sie variiert den einen Gedanken, daß die Weisheit bei den Geschöpfen nicht zu finden sei' (Hontheim, p. 221). The same uniformity is encountered 'in der festgeschlossenen symmetrischen Form'. The symmetry is not only evident from vv. 12 and 20, but also from v. 16a. This colon can be taken as the kernel of the 'Zwischenstrophe' because it is repeated almost verbatim in v. 19b.[12]

Especially about poems of some length it seldom happens that two scholars come to perfect agreement on the question of strophic structure. Therefore, it is noteworthy that Condamin declares regarding Job 28: 'La division du poème, établie par J. Hontheim, paraît incontestable' (p. 203). This scholar has tried to consolidate the strophic structure advocated by Hontheim by means of pointing to the 'répétitions verbales' which are woven into this poem; cf. above (a), about Schlottmann. According to Condamin in ch. 28, as distinct from the other poems in the book of Job, these repetitions 'se présentent, parallèlles ou symétriques, très nettement' (p. 203).[13]

In my opinion, the rhetorical structure of Job 28 shows to best advantage when seen within the framework advocated by Stickel. In other words, the structural insights which have been put forward on the basis of thematic connections and verbal repetitions are integrated most convincingly when we take as our starting point that the refrain of vv. 12 and 20 is a *closing line* at the end of the second and the third cantos of the poem. Next, I think, that the strophic divisions proposed by Stickel and Delitzsch (strophes of four masoretic verses) on the one hand, and Vetter and De Wilde on the other hand (see anal. 2.5) do not exclude each other, but must be taken as complementary. Ch. 28 shows a ‘strophic’ framework which is very rigorously carried through.[14] That is to say, the poem is composed of three uniform cantos of eight lines each (vv. 5–12, 13–20 and 21–28), which are preceded by an opening canto of half this length, four lines (vv. 1–4). Next, each of the eight-line cantos falls into two uniform canticles of four lines. These in turn can be divided into strophes of two lines, just like the introductory canto in vv. 1–4. Nearly all the lines of the poem consist of two cola, except those of the last strope of the introductory canto, vv. 3–4. In this way, the caesura between the introduction and the corpus of the poem is neatly marked by a strophe of two tricola (cf. anal. 2.1); see also the last line of the poem as a whole, v. 28.

---

[10] See also pp. 75–78 where we find a translation of this chapter. In this translation v. 28 is printed with interspacing, just like vv. 12 and 20.

[11] De Wilde takes vv. 1–4 as a later addition and from v. 5 onwards he divides the poem into three identical parts; 'die ersten zwei Teile endigen mit dem Refrain in Frageform; am Ende ist der Refrain in affirmativer Gestaltung transformiert' (p. 269).

[12] See further Van der Lugt (1988), p. 275.

[13] See further Van der Lugt (1988), p. 276 and for 'a provisional judgement' of the divisions described above, pp. 276–78. We can ascertain time and again that the notion of the verbal repetitions, which are supposed to confirm the various structural interpretations, is incomplete and selective, and therefore open to more than one explanation. This is a serious fault of previous research as far as its formal approach is concerned.

This rhetorical framework of ch. 28 is especially supported by an analysis of its verbal repetitions (anal. 2.4). This approach brings to light special patterns which form a reliable basis, I think, to determine the rhetorical framework of the poem on all its structural levels (from the cantos to the strophes). The patterns of responsions which emerge on the level of the canto structure of Job 28 provide the clearest evidence. The repetitions at the beginning and at the end of these main parts (vv. 5–12, 13–20 and 21–28) and in the introductory section (vv. 1–4) deserve particular attention. Apart from the well-known refrain in vv. 12 and 20 there appear to be other, equally striking clusters of repetitions. These clusters too can be designated as refrains.[15] In the first place I mention the repetitions which emerge in a comparison of vv. 1–2 and 5–6, the first strophes of cantos I–II; see anal. 2.4.5. There are no less than five responsions; note *yṣʾ* (‘to go out’), *mqwm* (‘place’), *zhb* (‘gold’), *ʿpr* (‘dust’) and *ʾbn* (‘stone’). A close analysis reveals that the poet adheres to this pattern throughout his composition, as is evident from the repetitions in the first strophes of cantos II, III and IV; note *ʾrṣ* (‘earth’), *ḥyh* (‘to live’) and *ʾmr* (‘to say’) in anal. 2.4.5. We are obviously dealing here with ‘refrain-strophes’.

The responsions at the end of the cantos, furthermore, are not restricted to the refrain which concludes the second and the third cantos (vv. 12 and 20), but are also demonstrable in the last line of canto IV; note the parallel word-pair *ḥkmh* (‘wisdom’)/*bynh* (‘understanding’) in vv. 12, 20 and 28

---

[14] Against Habel’s view that any efforts at neat strophic division are futile (p. 393).

[15] Cf. the definition of ‘refrain’ offered by Watson: ‘A refrain is a block of verse which recurs more than once within a poem. Such a block can comprise a single word, a line of poetry or even a complete strophe’ (1984, p. 295).

(anal. 2.4.5).[16] It is especially worth noting that cantos II–IV each end with the noun *bynh* (see vv. 12b, 20b and 28c; 'epiphora').[17] We come across the word-pair *ḥkmh/bynh* only in the lines just mentioned, that is to say, each time at regular intervals of eight lines counting back from the end of the poem. The combination of this fact with the pattern of responsions in vv. 1–2, 5–6, 13–14 and 21–22 firmly constitutes the eight-line canto structure of Job 28, in which the repeated lines of vv. 12 and 20 act as a *closing* refrain. A further analysis of the verbal repetitions reveals that the pattern of responsions on the level of the poem as a whole is not restricted to the beginning and the end of the cantos (the first and the last strophes of these units), but is to be found in the canticles as complete units; see anal. 2.4.5.

The patterns of the verbal repetitions within the cantos themselves on the one hand support the canto structure of the poem described above, and on the other hand determine the inner framework of the cantos. In the light of this approach the third canto (vv. 13–20) shows a very solid inner framework. The repetition of the negation *l'*, which dominates the canto as a whole, is striking, also in the context of the poem in its entirety (cf. anal. 2.4.1). Note *l'* internally parallel *l'* in the odd lines (except v. 17) and *l'* in the first cola of the even lines (except v. 20, but see also v. 17; anal. 2.4.4). The same is also the case with the suffix *-h* and to the root *'rk* ('to be equal'); note also *l' tslh bktm/bktm* ... *l' tslh* (see anal. 2.4.4).[18] The repetition of the verb *hpk* ('to demolish') in canto II (vv. 5b and 9b) is already an indication of division into four-line canticles. These four-line canticles can be discerned in each of the eight-line cantos; see *'rk* in canto III, and *byn* ('to understand') and *r'h* ('to see') in canto IV (anal. 2.4.4).

The verbal repetitions within canticles III.2 and IV.2 (vv. 17–20 and 25–28 resp.) display a linear, parallel pattern and support the bipartite structure of these sections. Canticle IV.1 (vv. 21–24), on the contrary, shows a symmetric pattern of verbal repetitions; see anal. 2.4.3. Nevertheless, there are indications that each four-line unit in ch. 28 divides into two strophes of two lines; see anal. 2.4.2.[19] The two lines of vv. 9–10 belong together on the basis of the repetition of the preposition *b-* (anal. 2.4.2).

---

[16] For this word-pair see part III, 11.6.

[17] Cf., e.g., *w'ynny* as the final word in cantos I and III in Job 7.

[18] These formal considerations prove that vv. 15–20 cannot be removed from MT; against Dillmann, Budde, Hölscher, and Geller's recent 'literary' analysis (see Geller, p. 175; cf. anal. 2.5). See in this context also *ksp*, *spyr*, *ḥyh*, *ḥkmh* in anal. 2.4.5.

[19] 'Man verachte nicht solche Kleinigkeiten' (Hontheim, p. 221). For the two-line strophes in this poem see also Duhm, Peters, Hölscher and De Wilde; and for the strophes of canto IV Schlottmann, Hontheim, Condamin (anal. 2.5). For the strophes of vv. 1–2 and 3–4 see Geller (pp. 157–58 and 161 resp.).

This preposition is lacking in v. 11. Formally seen, vv. 11–12 form a close unit in the context of the overall structure of the poem. In vv. 1–2 and 5–6 the root *yṣ'* precedes the noun *mqwm*. We come across the same pattern in vv. 11–12; note *yṣ'* in v. 11b and *mqwm* in v. 12b. Especially the combination of *r'h* and *byn* in vv. 27–28 suggests that formally seen these lines belong together in one strophe; see anal. 2.4.4.[20]

This formal approach provides a basis for the analysis of the flow of contents in the poem. It is possible now to attain a coherent picture of the alternation of motifs and the progression of the ideas on the various structural levels; see anal. 2.2. From a thematic point of view the most coherent sections occur at the level of the four-line canticles. In the introductory section (canto I, vv. 1–4) we meet two themes. The first strophe (vv. 1–2) deals with the *place*, where precious metals can be found. The second strophe (vv. 3–4) contains the theme of the *process of acquiring* the precious metals.[21] The introductory character of the strophes concerned finds expression in the fact that these themes are elaborated in the second canto. That is to say, canticle II.1 (vv. 5–8) works out the motif of *place* and canticle II.2 (vv. 9–12) the motif of the *process of acquiring*; cf. anal. 2.2 and Geller, pp. 160–61. The first strophe of canticle II.1 (vv. 5–6) formulates the idea of vv. 1–2 in a corresponding way: there is a place on earth (where a wealth of powers and riches is concealed; cf. anal. 2.4.5! and Budde [1913] about v. 6). This positive statement is contrasted by the following strophe (vv. 7–8), which emphasizes that this place is very hard to reach. The strophe as a whole is dominated by the negation *l'*; it is used four times, once in each colon (anal. 2.4.2). In the first strophe of canticle II.2 (vv. 9–10) we again meet the theme of vv. 3–4: mankind digs for riches in the earth. Cf. also *kl* (in vv. 3b and 10b) and *qṣ śm lḥšk/r'th 'ynw* (in vv. 3a and 10b resp.).[22] In view of content v. 11 belongs with vv. 9–10 (the process of acquiring). By using the mythological term *mbky nhrwt* (v. 11a; cf. also *t'lmh* in v. 11b), which according to Canaanite tradition denotes the abode of El, the poet most clearly celebrates the achievements of man:

---

[20] Notwithstanding his 'literary' approach, Geller's prejudice as to MT (note p. 155 and n. 97 [p. 187]) prevents him from seeing this formal pattern; see p. 174.

[21] Niccacci and Habel defend that the whole poem is governed by *three* motifs. Habel's analysis has as flaws, among other things, that the second and the third motif (the way of access to the precious item and the process of acquiring the item) are not clearly distinguished from each other in the poem. Further the 'key organizing term' *'lm* coincides in v. 11b with Habel's B-motif (Discovery/Acquisition), but in v. 21a with motif A (Place/Source).

[22] Against Andersen, who connects vv. 9–10 with 5–6 and 1–2; cf. also Clark (1982), p. 402 (vv. 10–11 repeat ideas and themes of vv. 5–6 and 1–2), and Geller, p. 162 (v. 5 takes up themes from vv. 3–4).

he even penetrates to the remotest areas of the earth. This line forms a striking contrast with the desperate question of v. 12, 'where can wisdom be found?'. Formally seen, however, the lines of vv. 11 and 12 constitute a strophe; see above. Thus, from a thematic point of view, the poet created a great inner tension in the last strophe of canto II, some kind of antithetic parallelism; see anal. 2.2. In this manner the poet stresses the inability of mankind to force its way into the ultimate secrets of creation. The strophe of vv. 11-12 as a whole is overshadowed by the negative statement of the final line: mankind is *not able* to achieve wisdom; cf. vv. 7–8. The 'antithetic parallelism' forms a characteristic device of closure at the end of canto II. I conclude that the beginning of this poem has a very well thought-out framework. The following scheme tries to visualize its rhetorical structure:

introductory section I	vv. 1–2	+A
	vv. 3–4	+B
canticle II.1	vv. 5–6	+A
	vv. 7–8	–A
canticle II.2	vv. 9–10	+B
	vv. 11–12	–B

In view of content the third canto (vv. 13–20) shows much less tension within its corpus than the preceding one. The whole section is governed by the negative idea that wisdom is unattainable for mankind (cf. Geller, p. 165); note *l'* in analysis 2.4.4 (cf. above). In this way the canto connects with the thought of the final strophe of canto II (vv. 11–12). We are dealing here with the device of thematic extension, some kind of 'enjambement'. This poetic device coincides with the concatenatio between the cantos II and III described in anal. 2.4.5.

True, there is little suspense in the corpus of the third canto. However, as far as content is concerned we can observe a sharp contrast between cantos III and IV. The negation of canto III, that wisdom is not to be found on earth, is balanced by the statement of the following canto (vv. 21–28) that God is acquainted with the place of wisdom. Nevertheless, we are again dealing with a kind of 'enjambement'. The first strophe of canto IV (vv. 21–22) carries the theme of the third canto to its climax: wisdom is hidden from the eyes of all living creatures, nor does it exist in the realm of the underworld. See also the concatenatio between cantos III and IV described in anal. 2.4.5. At the same time, the strophe contains an obvious allusion to the first strophe of canto III. In v. 22 the poet introduces the speaking divinities of death, just as in v. 14 he casually makes the divinities of the abyss speak.[23] This thematic correspondence matches the verbal repetitions which occur in vv. 5 6, 13–14 and 21 -22, as pointed out above. The thematic link between canto III and the first strophe of canto IV (vv. 21–22) leads up to a strong thematic tension in the fourth canto. The negative idea of vv. 21 -22 again forms a sharp contrast with the statement of vv. 23 ·24 that *God* knows the place of wisdom; note *'lhym* ... *whw'* ... *ky hw'* in vv. 23–24.

The rhetorical analysis sheds special light on the progress of the thought development within the cantos and on the transitions from one canto to another. In broad outline, the poem displays a lively concept. At the same time, the motifs and themes of the individual strophes more than once plainly support the analysis of the verbal repetitions. The formal framework also elucidates the introductory function of the first four lines of the poem. As we have seen, only Ley had a vague notion of the true character of this unit.[24] This structural analysis furthermore reveals that v. 28, which line is often considered to be a later addition,[25] constitutes an indispensable building block in the poem. Thus, it cannot possibly be correct when an insurmountable contrast is being created between the theology of v. 28 and the preceding lines. Fohrer, e.g., states: 'Daß V. 28 mit seiner nach dem Vorhergehenden etwas platt wirkenden Mahnung ein späterer Zusatz zum Lied ist, sollte nicht bestritten werden' (p. 392 n. 4); see also Müller (1978, p. 134). Cuttting away the final line from ch. 28 is to remove the core from the poem. By this procedure the exegete also deprives himself of the opportunity ever to be able to interpret the poem in its present context.[26] Thus, the *main theme* of the poem is formulated in the refrains at the end of the eight-line cantos, vv. 12, 20 and 28: *A human being is unable to understand the ultimate secrets of the universe* (vv. 12 and 12), *his wisdom consists in 'fearing God'* (v. 28).

---

[23] This correspondence is also noted by Möller (p. 66), Terrien (p. 192 n. 2), Webster (pp. 54–55) and Habel (p. 393); cf. further Geller, n. 35 (p. 182).

[24] In this context I recall the remark by Andersen concerning v. 1a ('there are mines for silver'): 'at once an intriguing riddle in the true Wisdom mode' (p. 224 n. 1). In my opinion, this characterization as a riddle applies to the introductory section (vv. 1–4) as a whole.

[25] So Duhm, Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Hölscher, Westermann, Fohrer, Müller (1978). See also C. Kuhl (1953), p. 283; Lévêque (1970), pp. 595–96 and 606; C. Baldauf, 'Menschliches Können und göttliche Weisheit in Hiob 28', *Theologische Versuche* 13 (1983), pp. 65–66; Vermeylen (1986), pp. 14 and 76; and Geller, p. 174. Otherwise Smick, p. 92.

[26] See part VII, 2.3 and for the relationship between chs. 27 and 28 part VII, 2.4.

3 Job’s last speech (1): Job 29

Structure: 9.8.7 > 5.4|4.4|2.5 > 2.3|2.2||2.2|2.2||2|2.3

I.1	2	*my ytn**ny** Kyrḥy qdm*	*KYMY ’LWH yšmr**ny***	
	3	*bhlw nrw ‘ly R’Šy*	*L’WRW ’LK ḥšk*	
	4	*K’šr hyyty bYMY ḥrpy*	*bswd ’LWH ‘ly ’hly*	
	5	*b‘wd šdy ‘MDY*	*sbybwty n‘ry*	
	6	*brḥṣ HLYKy bḥmh*	*wṣwr yṣwq ‘MDY plgy šmn*	
I.2	7	*bṣ’ty š‘r ‘ly qrt*	*brḥwb ’kyn MWŠBy*	
	8	*r’w**ny** n‘rym wNḤB’W*	*wyšyšym qmw ‘mdw*	
	9	*śrym ‘ṣrw bMLYM*	*wkp yśymw lPYHM*	
	10	*qwl ngydym NḤB’W*	*wlšwnM lḥkM dbqh*	
II.1	11	*ky ’zn šm‘h wt’šrny*	*w**‘yn** r’th wt‘ydny*	
	12	*ky ’mlṭ ‘ny mšw‘*	*wytwm w**l’** ‘zr LW*	
	13	*brkt ’bd ‘ly tb’*	*wlb ’lmnh ’rnn*	
	14	*ṣdq lbšty wylbšny*	***k**m‘yl wṣnyp mšpṭy*	
II.2	15	***‘ynym** hyyty l‘wr*	*wrglym lpsḥ ’ny*	
	16	*’b ’nky l’bywnym*	*wrb **l’** yd‘ty ’ḥqrhw*	
	17	*W’šbrh mtl‘wt ‘wl*	*wmšnyw ’šlyk ṭrp*	
	18	*W’mr ‘m qny ’gwh*	*w**k**ḥwl ’rbh ymym*	
III.1	19	*šršy ptwḥ ’ly mym*	*wṭl ylyn bqṣyry*	
	20	*kbwdy ḥdš ‘MDY*	*wqšty bydy tḥlyp*	
III.2	21	*LY šm‘w WYḤLW*	*wydmw lmw ‘ṣty*	
	22	*’ḥry dbry l’ yšnw*	*w‘lymw ttp MLTy*	
	23	*WYḤLW kmṭr LY*	*wPYHM p‘rw lmlqwš*	
	24	*’śḥq ’lHM l’ y’mynw*	*w’WR pny l’ ypylwn*	
	25	*’bḥr drkM w’ŠB R’Š*	*w’škwn kmlk bgdwd*	*k’šr ’blym ynḥm*

3.1 Text

V. 4b—*bswd*: according to Habel the traditional translation 'intimacy, friendship' for *swd* is quite appropriate here (cf. Gordis and Hartley). Others read *b-* contracted with infinitive of *ysd* ('when He established'; so Pope, Blommerde, Ceresko), or *bswk* ('when He protected'; so Hölscher, Fohrer, HAL, Van Selms, Rozelaar; cf. BHS).

V. 14a—*wylbšny*: we are probably dealing here with one of the few instances of enjambement between two successive cola within a poetic line (König, Hölscher, Fohrer; cf. Job 4,8 10,8 24,5a-b 28,3b–c 30,1a–b 31,13). Most scholars prefer to translate 'and it clothed itself with me' (Ceresko: 'and it adorned me'). Anyhow, the length of the cola indicates that the masoretic accentuation is reliable and v. 14 cannot be a real tricolon as Andersen and Habel will have it (cf. v. 25). See also N.M. Waldman, *JANES* 19 (1989), pp. 166–67.

V. 18b—*wkḥwl*: 'and like the phoenix' (HAL); for a discussion about *ḥwl* 'sand or phoenix' see Ceresko, pp. 22–26 (cf. also Gordis and Habel).

V. 25c: the poem is closed by a tricolon. Andersen and Gordis take v. 25 as two bicola. Some scholars, who transpose vv. 21–25 (see anal. 3.6), delete the third colon (Duhm, Driver-Gray, Hölscher, Fohrer, De Wilde; see also Weiser, Epping-Nelis and Lescow). However, v. 25c *at the end* of the poem corresponds with the *last line* of the following poem; note the root *'bl* ('to mourn') in 29,25c and 30,31a! (cf. the responsio at the end of chs. 25–26 and 27; see anal. 1.6 above). This responsio at the end of successive poems also speaks against the emendation *'bylm* ('I guided them'); so Herz, *ZAW* 20 (1900), p. 163, and Dhorme. It also militates against the interpretation of *'bl* as 'camel' (so Gordis).

3.2 Content

Job's former blessings and prestige.

I The blessings Job received from God and the honour he received from men.
  I.1 If only God *blessed* me as he did in former days (vv. 2–6).
  I.2 Job's past honour.
    All people were deeply impressed when I took my seat in the square (vv. 7–8).
    Then, the nobles refrained from talking (vv. 9–10).
II Job's striving for justice.
  II.1 People *blessed* me (vv. 11, 13a) because I did justice to the socially oppressed (vv. 12, 13b–14; v. 14 summarizing metaphor).

II.2 I was a prop and stay to everybody who needed help (vv. 15–16).
I took action against the oppressors (v. 17), and thought to be rewarded with a long life span (v. 18, conclusion; cf. v. 14).

III Job’s former blessings and prestige.

III.1 Metaphorical description of Job’s former *blessings* (vv. 19–20; cf. vv. 3 and 6).

III.2 People were impressed by my counsel (vv. 21–22; cf. vv. 9–10);
and I was greatly honoured by them (vv. 23–25; cf. vv. 7–8).

3.3 Transition markers

3.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

3.3.1.1 *my ytn*, v. 2a
’ny, v. 15b
w- beginn. line, v. 17a; ext.
// *w-* beginn. line in v. 18a
cohortative: *’šbrh*, v. 17a
w- beginning line, v. 23a

3.3.1.2 no remarks

3.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

3.3.2.1 *’nky*, v. 16a
’mr, v. 18a

3.3.2.2 no remarks

3.3.3 Contrary indications

no remarks

3.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

3.4.1 General survey

’: *’wr*, vv. 3, 24; *’lwh*, vv. 2, 4; *’ly*/*’l*, vv. 19 and 24 resp.; *’ny*/*’nky*, vv. 15 and 16 resp.; *’šr* (pron. relativum), vv. 4, 25—see also *’šr* (verb) in v. 11

b: *b-*, vv. 3, 4, 4, 5, 6, 6, 7, 7, 9, 19, 20, 25

h: *hyh*, vv. 4, 15; *hlk*, vv. 3, 6; *-hm*, vv. 9, 23, 24

w: *-w*, vv. 3 (3×), 12, 17

ḥ: *ḥb’*, vv. 8, 10

y: *-y*, vv. 3, 4, 4, 5 (3×), 6, 6, 7, 7, 13, 14, 18, 19, 19, 20 (4×), 21, 21, 22, 22, 23, 24; *ywm*, vv. 2, 4, 18; *yḥl*, vv. 21, 23; *yšb*, vv. 7, 25

k: *k-*, vv. 2, 2, 4, 14, 18, 23, 25, 25; *ky*, vv. 11, 12
l: *l-*, vv. 3, 9, 10, 12, 15, 15, 16, 21, 21, 23, 23; *l’*, vv. 12, 16, 22, 24, 24; *lbš*, vv. 14, 14
m: *-m*, vv. 10, 10, 25; *-mw/-mw*, vv. 21 and 22 resp.; *mll*, vv. 9, 22
n: *-ny*, vv. 2, 2, 8, 11, 11, 14; *n‘r*, vv. 5, 8
‘: *‘wd* (‘duration’)/*‘wd* (hiph‘il ‘to bear witness’), vv. 5 and 11 resp.; *‘yn*, vv. 11, 15; *‘l*, vv. 13, 22; *‘ly*, vv. 3, 4, 7—see also *‘lh* in v. 14; *‘md-*, vv. 5, 6, 20—see also *‘md* in v. 8
p: *ph*, vv. 9, 23
r: *r’h*, vv. 8, 11; *r’š*, vv. 3, 25
š: *šm‘*, vv. 11, 21

3.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 4–6: *bswd/b‘wd*, vv. 4b and 5a resp.—alliter. (Hartley); see also *sbybwty* in v. 5b
’lwh/šdy, vv. 4b and 5a resp.
‘mdy, vv. 5a.6b
vv. 9–10: *śr/ngyd*, vv. 9a and 10a resp.
mll/qwl, vv. 9a and 10a resp.
l-, vv. 9b.10b
-hm/-m, vv. 9b and 10b (2×) resp.
vv. 11–12: *ky*, vv. 11a.12a!—exactly linear
šm‘h/mšw‘, vv. 11a and 12a resp.—alliteration
vv. 13–14: *-y*, vv. 13a.14b; see also *-ny* in v. 14a
‘ly/m‘yl, vv. 13a and 14b resp.—alliteration
vv. 15–16: *l-*, vv. 15a+b.16a
’ny/’nky, vv. 15b and 16a resp.!
vv. 17–18: *w’šbrh/w’mr*, vv. 17a and 18a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear (anaphora)
vv. 19–20: *b-*, vv. 19b.20b
vv. 21–22: *-mw/-mw*, vv. 21b and 22b resp.!
vv. 23–25: *k-*, vv. 23a.25b+c—inclusio
-hm, vv. 23b.24a; see also *-m* in v. 25a
l’ ypylwn/’blym, vv. 24b and 25c resp.—alliteration

3.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 2–6 (I.1): *k-*, vv. 2a+b.4a—linear
ymy, vv. 2b.4a—linear

’lwh, vv. 2b.4b!—linear
‘ly, vv. 3a.4b—concatenatio
hlk, vv. 3b.6a!—linear
vv. 7–10 (I.2): *nḥb’w*, vv. 8a.10a!—exactly linear
vv. 11–14 (II.1): *’šr/brk*, vv. 11a and 13a resp.
-ny, vv. 11a+b.14a—inclusio
ytwm/’lmnh, vv. 12b and 13b resp.—concatenatio
vv. 21–25 (III.2): *ly*, vv. 21a.23a!—linear } chiasm
wyḥlw, vv. 21a.23a!—linear } chiasm
lmw/lmlqwš, vv. 21b and 23b resp. (alliter.)—linear
l’, vv. 22a.24a+b

3.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–10 (canto I): *-ny*, vv. 2a+b.8a—linear
‘ly, vv. 3a+4b.7a!
‘mdy/‘mdw, vv. 5a+6b and 8b resp.—alliter.
n‘rym, vv. 5b.8a!
šmn/lšwnm, vv. 6b and 10b resp. (alliteration) —linear

vv. 11–18 (canto II): *‘yn*, vv. 11b.15a!—linear
l’, vv. 12b.16b—exactly linear; see also *l’bywnym* in v. 16a—alliteration
l-, vv. 12b.15a+b+16a—linear
k-, vv. 14b.18b—exactly linear

vv. 19–25 (canto III): *’ly/’l*, vv. 19a and 24a resp.!
b-, vv. 19b+20b.25b—inclusio

3.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–6.21–25—inclusio: *r’š*, vv. 3a.25a! } chiasm; note *’wrw/w’wr*—alliteration
’wr, vv. 3b.24b! (Habel) } chiasm; note *’wrw/w’wr*—alliteration
k’šr, vv. 4a and 25c!

vv. 2–6.11–14.19–20: *yšmrny/wt’šrny* … *wt‘ydny*, vv. 2b and 11 resp.—linear; see also *-ny* in vv. 2a and 14a, and cf. *šršy* in v. 19a (alliter.)
l...*w/lw*, vv. 3b and 12b resp.!—linear

‘wd/‘wd, vv. 5a and 11b resp.!
‘mdy, vv. 5a+6b.20a!

vv. 7–10.15–18.21–25: *brḥwb/’bḥr*, vv. 7b and 25a resp.—alliteration
yšb, vv. 7b.25a!; see also *škn* in v. 25b!
śr … ngyd/mlk, vv. 9a+10a and 25b resp.—lin.
mll, vv. 9a.22b!
pyhm, vv. 9b.23b!; see also *-hm* in v. 24a!—linear
qwl/’mr, vv. 10a and 18a resp.—exactly linear; see also *dbr* in v. 22a
-m, vv. 10b (2×).25a!—linear
wlšwnm/wmšnyw/yšnw, vv. 10b, 17b and 22a resp.—alliteration
lḥkm/wkḥwl, vv. 10b and 18b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
rgl/drk, vv. 15b and 25a resp.!
’b … l’bywnym wrb l’/’blym, vv. 16 and 25c resp.—alliteration
w- beginning line, vv. 17+18.23!—linear
k-, vv. 18b.23a+25b+c—linear

3.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

3.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

b-, *-y*, *ywm* (v. 18), *l-*

3.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

hyh, *-w*, (*lbš*), *‘l*, *r’h*, *šm‘*

3.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–6.7–12.13–17|18–20.21–25|… (5.6.5|3.5|…)
Stickel (1842): 2–6|7–10.11–14.15–17.18–20|21–25||… (5|4.4.3.3|5||…)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–11||12–14.15–17.18–20||21–23.24–25 (2.3|2.3||3.3.3||3.2)
Ewald (1854): 2–10.11–20.21–25|…
Merx (1871): 2–5.6–9.10–13.14–17|18–20.21–23.24–25… (4×8|6.6.5…)
Hitzig (1874): 2–6.7–9|11–17|18–20.21–25 (5.3|7|3.5)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–6.7–10.11–14.15–17.18–20.21–25 (10.8.8.6.6.11); cf. Stickel
Wright (1883): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–14|15–16.17–20.21–24.25+30,1|… (4.6.8.8|4.8.8.6|…)

Dillmann (1891): 2–4.5–7.8–10|11–14.15–17|18–20.21–23.24–25 (6.6.6|8.6|6.6.5); cf. König (1929)

Bickell (1894): 2–3.4+6.7–8.9+11.12–13.14–15.16–17.21–22

Ley (1895): 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–13|14–17.18–20.21–23.24–25 (4×3|4.3.3.3); cf. Dillmann (1891)

Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10+21.22–23.24–25b.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20|...; cf. Hölscher (1952)

Vetter (1897): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–10.21–23.24–25+11|12–14.15–17|18–20|...

Hontheim (1904): 2–7.12–17|18–20+11|8–10+21.22–25 (6.6|4|4.4)

Budde (1913): 2–6.7–10+21–25b+11.14–17.18–20; cf. Dhorme (1926)

Schlögl (1916): 2–7.12–17.11+18–20+8–9.10+21–25 (12.12.12.12)

Löhr (1918): 2–9.10–17.18–25 (4×2|4×2|4×2)

Peters (1928): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–10|11–12.13–14.15–17|18–20|21–23.24–25 (2.3|2.2|2.2.3|3|3.2)

Kissane (1939): 2–7.8–13.14–20.21–25+30,1... (6.6.6.6...)

RSV (1952): 2–20.21–25; similarly TOB (1978)

Möller (1955), p. 68: 2–17.18–25.30,1–15|... (16.8.16[!]|...)

Fohrer (1963): 2–6.7–10+21.22–25b+11.12–17.18–20 (5.5.5.6.3)

Terrien (1963): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–11|21–22.23–25|12–13.14–17|18–20.30,1–2

Skehan (1964): 2–4.5–7.8–10.21–23.24–25b+11+25c.12–14.15–17.18–20.30,1–2.3–5.6–8||... (11×3||...); cf. NAB (1970)

Gordis (1978), note p. 540: 2–6.7–10.11–17.18–20.21–25 (a.b.c.d.b')

Ceresko (1980): 2–3.4–6.7–10.11–14.15–17.18–20.21–23.24–25; cf. Peters (1928)

KBS (1980): 2–3.4–10.11–18.19–25

De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–10.21+23.22+24.25a–b+11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18–20...

Van Selms (1982): 2–11.12–17.18–25|...

Webster (1984): 2–6.7–10.11–14.15–17.18–20.21–25|... (a.b.c.c'.a'.b'|...); cf. Epping-Nelis (1968), Rozelaar(1984), Hartley (1988)

Habel (1985): 2.3–6.7–10|11.12–13.14.15–16.17|18–20.21–24.25 (v. 2, a.b.c.a'.b', v. 25; v. 14 'pivotal verse'); cf. Webster (1984)

Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–4.5–7||8–11.12–14.15–17||18–20.21–23.24–25 (3.3|4.3.3|3.3.2)

Smick (1986), pp. 92–93: 2–6.7–11.12–17.18–20.21–25 (a.b.c.a'.b'; v. 14 'key line'); cf. Habel (1985)

Lescow (1992), pp. 159–64: 2–6|7–10|11.12–14.15–17|21–25b (10|8|2.6.6|10; a.b.c.b')

3.6 Comments and summary

A new heading, similar to that of ch. 27, introduces a new speech by Job in chs. 29–31. It is generally agreed that this speech consists of three parts, of which the dividing lines coincide with the chapter divisions. In ch. 29 Job describes his former blessings and prestige, in ch. 30 his present disgrace and misery, and in ch. 31 we meet his extensively developed oath of innocence. As the following analyses will show, each of these parts represents an individual poem with a rhetorical coherence all its own.

It is not really an exaggeration to say that previous research was rather at a loss about the structure of ch. 29. Some scholars imagined to discern two main parts, vv. 2–17 and 18–25 (so Köster, Merx, Möller; cf. Wright and Ley in anal. 3.5). Schlottmann assumed a tripartite overall structure for this poem, vv. 2–11, 12–20, 21–25.[1] As to the tripartite structure Schlottmann was followed by Ewald, Hitzig, Dillmann, Löhr, König. And presently such a division is advocated by Van Selms and Habel; cf. also KBS, Webster and Smick. However, these critics, who are in favour of three main parts, do not agree about the exact position of the disjunctions. Hitzig, Dillmann, König and Habel, e.g., take vv. 11–17 as the second main part; see further anal. 3.5. Finally, since Duhm scholars have generally experienced the original position of vv. 21–25 as a major obstacle in the poem's train of thought. These lines, which thematically link up with the description of the abundant honour Job formerly received in vv. 7–10, are usually transposed therefore to follow v. 10.[2]

It has to be noted as a remarkable outcome of recent research that vv. 21–25 in their original position fit very well into the rhetorical design of ch. 29.[3] Webster, Habel and Smick in principle agree that the poem displays an a.b.c.a'.b.' pattern (cf. also Lescow; see anal. 3.5). According to this design vv. 21–25 (about Job's previous position of honour) thematically link up with vv. 7–10/11, just as vv. 18–20 link up with vv. 2/3–6 (Job's blessings). Habel and Smick further take v. 14 as the pivotal line in the central unit about Job's administration of justice, vv. 11/12–17. This result is to be welcomed as a sound point of departure for further investigation.

---

[1] 'Wehmüthige Erinnerung an das Glück, die Ehre und das Ansehen, deren er früher genoß (vv. 2–11); 'Dieses Ansehen gründete sich auf seinen für das Recht der Verfolgten stets bewiesenen Eifer, darum er auch glaubte, auf die Dauer seines Glücks rechnen zu können (vv. 12–20); 'Zusammenfassung der beiden vorhergehenden Momente' (vv. 21–25).

[2] So Duhm, Vetter, Budde, Dhorme, Hölscher, Skehan, Fohrer, Terrien, Pope, De Wilde; cf. also Hontheim in anal. 3.5.

[3] Cf. also former views by König, Andersen and Gordis (Special Note 25).

My own structural analysis differs from nearly all previous attempts to determine the poetic framework of ch. 29, because I combine v. 18 with the preceding line and take the strophe of vv. 17–18 as the end of the second main part, vv. 11-18 (canto II).[4] Vv. 18–20 are usually taken as a close unit, which describes the blessings Job expects on the basis of his striving for justice (vv. 12–17). The structural approach by Webster, Habel and Smick, however, universally fails to note that the linear parallelism between vv. 2–10(/11) and 18(/19)–25 (a.b, a'.b'; see above) is not confined to the first and the third canto only, but that to the central unit of the poem, on Job's administration of justice (c), also harmonizes with this pattern. Webster and Habel correctly separate v. 11 from vv. 7–10, because the line does no longer deal with the *honour*, but with the *blessings* Job received from men (see also v. 13a); note *'šr* pi'el in v. 11a and cf. anal. 3.4.3 and 3.4.5 (against Smick). Now, it is almost incomprehensible that Habel should see a correspondence between v. 11 and v. 17 (p. 407). To the contrary, it is quite obvious that the line of v. 11 (and v. 13a) thematically matches the descriptions of blessings in vv. 2–6 and 19(/18)–20 (element a). When we take v. 18 as the final line of canto II, the analysis of the verbal repetitions shows that the second part of this canto also joins the linear parallelism between the main units of the composition; note especially *qwl* ('voice')/*'mr* ('to say'), *lḥkm*/*wkḥwl*, *w-* beginning line and the preposition *k-* in anal. 3.4.5. These formal correspondences are further corroborated by a thematic link. Vv. 21–22 deal with Job's *speaking*. This 'speaking' refers to the silence of the elders when Job went out to take his seat in the city gate (vv. 7–10) and matches *w'mr* ('and I said/thought') in v. 18a. V. 18, furthermore, contains an allusion to Job's (postponed) death; note *'gwh* ('I will die'). This reference is a general device of closure in the book of Job and elsewhere in literature.[5] When we disjoin v. 18 from vv. 19–20, the latter unit also harmonizes better with the rhetorical context of the poem as a whole. In the lines of vv. 19–20, then, Job does not point to the blessings he expected on the basis of his benevolence (vv. 11–17), but describes his *former* blessings, as in vv. 2–6 and 11+13a!

The two themes (a and b) of cantos I and III divide these units into two canticles, vv. 2–6.7–10 and 19–20.21–25 resp.[6] This canticle division is supported by the linear verbal repetitions within the canticles themselves, described in anal. 3.4.3. Anal. 3.4.4 shows that the second canto also falls into two canticles (so also Webster);[7] note especially *ʿyn* (‘eye’) and the preposition *k*-. This division is supported by the special meaning of v. 14 at the end of canticle II.1. This line somehow matches v. 18 at the end of canticle II.2. V. 14 is a summarizing metaphor about Job’s striving for justice as formulated in vv. 12 and 13b; note the symmetric position of the word pair *ṣdq-mšpṭ*. In v. 14 ‘Job prides himself in being the paragon of justice’. V. 18 logically links up with v. 14, because on the basis of this line Job prides himself of being the ‘cognizant of how God should administer justice in his life’ (cf. Habel, p. 408). Within the canticle structure of canto II this *linear* semantic relationship between vv. 14 and 18 formally coincides with *ʿyn* in vv. 11b and 15a.

---

[4] So also KBS and cf. Duhm in anal. 3.5.

[5] See Barbara Herrnstein-Smith, 'Poetic Closure. A Study in How Poems End', Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 101–02 and 175–78.

[6] Cf. Stickel, Delitzsch, Peters, Gordis, Ceresko and Webster in anal. 3.5.

Having established the rhetorical structure of ch. 29 on the levels of the cantos and the canticles, the strophic division proper does not present major problems. The two-line strophe dominates this poem.[8] The first canticle of the poem (I.1) winds up with a strophe of three lines (vv. 4–6), just like the final canticle of the poem (III.2, vv. 23–25). For the strophic structure see anal. 3.2 and 3.4.2–3. The numerous responsions in canticle I.1 (anal. 3.4.3) constitute an obvious *parallelismus stropharum* between vv. 2–3 and 4–6.[9] See for v. 23 as the first line of a strophe also *w*- beginning line in anal. 3.3.1.1.

The *main theme* of the poem is to be found at the beginning of the cantos, where the idea of *Job’s former blessings* occurs time after time; see vv. 2–6, 11+13a and 19–20.

---

[7] Cf. Stickel, Delitzsch, Wright, Dillmann, Ceresko in anal. 3.5.

[8] For the strophic structure of vv. 2–14 see also Peters and for the two-line strophes of vv. 11–20 also Duhm in anal. 3.5.

[9] The linear parallelism between vv. 2–3 and 4–6 tells against the structural interpretation by Habel, which takes v. 2 as a relatively independent introductory unit constituting a ‘balanced *inclusio*’ with v. 25 (p. 407).

4 Job’s last speech (2): Job 30

Structure: 9.8.8.8 > 9|4.4|4.4|4.4 > 3.3.3||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2

I	[1] *W‘TH śḥqw ‘LY*	*ṣ‘yrym MMNY lYMYM*	
	’šr m’sty ’bwtM	*lšyt ‘m klby ṣ’ny*	
	[2] **gm** *kḥ YDYHM lmh ly*	**‘lymw** *’bd klḥ*	[3] *bḥsr wbkpn [glmwd*
	h‘rqym ṣyh	*’mš šw’h wmš’h*	
	[4] *hqṭpym mlwḥ ‘ly* **śyḥ**	*wšrš rtmym lḥmM*	
	[5] **mn** *gw ygršw*	*yry‘w* **‘lymw** *kgnb*	
	[6] *b‘rwṣ nḥlym lškn*	*ḥry ‘pr wkpym*	
	[7] *byn* **śyḥym** *ynhqw*	*TḤT ḥrwl yspḥw*	
	[8] *bny nbl* **gm** *bny bly šm*	*nk’w* **mn** *h’rṣ*	

II.1	[9] *W‘TH ngyntM hyyty*	*w’hy lHM lmlh*	
	[10] *t‘bwny rḥqw MNY*	*wmpny L’ ḥśkw rq*	
	[11] *KY ytry ptḥ wy‘nny*	*wrsn mpny ŠLḤW*	
	[12] *‘l ymyn prḥḥ yqwmw*	*rgly ŠLḤW*	
II.2	*wyslw ‘ly ’rḥwt ’yd***m**	[13] *ntsw ntybty*	
	lhwty y‘ylw	*L’ ‘zr lmw*	
	[14] *kprṣ rḥb y’tyw*	*TḤT Š’H htglglw*	
	[15] *hhpk ‘ly blhwt*	*trdp kRWḤ ndbty*	*wk‘b ‘brh yš‘ty*

III.1	[16] *W‘TH ‘LY tštpk NPŠY*	*y’ḥzwny YMY ‘NY*
	[17] *lylh* **‘ṣm***y nqr m‘LY*	*w‘rqy L’ yškbwn*
	[18] *brb kḥ ytḥpś lbwšy*	*kpy ktnty y’zrny*
	[19] *hrny lḥmr*	*w’tmšl k‘pr w’pr*
III.2	[20] *’ŠW‘ ’lyk wL’ t‘nny*	*‘mdty wttbnn by*
	[21] *thpk l’kzr ly*	*b***‘ṣm** *ydk tśṭmny*
	[22] *tś’ny ’l RWḤ trkybny*	*wtmggny TŠWH*
	[23] *ky yd‘ty mwt tšybny*	*wbyt mw‘d lkl ḥy*

IV.1 [24] *’k L’ b‘y YŠLḤ YD* *’m bpydw lhn* **šw‘**
[25] *’m L’ bkyty lqšh YWM* *‘gmh NPŠY l’bywn*

[26] *KY ṭwb qwyty wyb’ r‘* *w’yḥlh l’wr wyb’ ’pl*
[27] *m‘y rtḥw wl’ dmw* *qdmny YMY ‘NY*

IV.2 [28] *qdr hlkty bL’ ḥmh* *qmty bqhl ’ŠW‘*
[29] *’ḥ* HYYTY L*tnym* *wr‘ lbnwt y‘nh*

[30] *‘wry šḥr m‘ly* *w‘ṣmy ḥrh mny ḥrp*
[31] *w*YHY L*’bl knry* *w‘gby lqwl bkym*

4.1 Text

V. 3: the first colon of this verse would better fit the context of v. 2 (Vetter [p. 28], Budde, Dhorme, Van Selms; cf. also Duhm). In that case, the first strophe of the poem is rounded off by a tricolon and the beginning of the second strophe is marked by *h-* (article) + part. pl. externally parallel with *h-* (article) + part. pl. in v. 4a (exactly linear).

V. 3c—*’mš*: meaning obscure.

V. 4b—*lḥmm*: probably prep. *l-* + inf. of *ḥmm* (‘to warm oneself’) + suff. 3 pl. masc. *-m*. But see T. Yamaga, *AJBI* 10 (1984), pp. 20–32; cf. also H. Kuhn, *BT* 40 (1989), pp. 332–36.

V. 11a—*ytry*: so Q and most modern scholars; K *ytrw* (so Hölscher).

Vv. 12–13: according to MT vv. 12–13 represent two tricola. V. 12c, however, as a third colon, is exceptionally long, four words (cf. vv. 3a and 15c, three words); furthermore, this colon forms a good parallelism with v. 13a (see *’rḥ // ntyb*). Therefore I take these verses as three bicola (cf. Dillmann and Kissane).

V. 13c—*l’ ‘zr lmw*: ‘there is no one to deliver from them’; so B.Q. Baisas, *UF* 5 (1973), p. 43 (and Habel; see also Ceresko).

V. 15b—*trdp*: is to be revocalised as a niph‘al; MT qal.

V. 18a—*ythpś*: *ḥpś* = *ḥbš* ‘bind’ (Gordis, Habel, Van Selms).

V. 20b—*wttbnn*: = *wl’ ttbnn*; the negative *l’* in v. 20a has a double-duty function (Gordis, Ceresko).

V. 22b—*tšwh*: so K = *tš’h* (from the root *šw’*, HAL) ‘crashing’ (Dhorme, Hölscher, Pope, Gordis, Van Selms, Hartley); Q *tšyh* ‘success’ (Kroeze, Habel).

V. 24—*b‘y* . . . *lhn šw‘*: obscure. In my opinion the NBG-translation comes very close to the meaning of the line: Indeed, would not one reach out his hand to a ruined man, if in his distress he cries for help (*šw‘*, perf. pi‘el 3 m. sg.; cf. also König and Gordis).

V. 28a—*ḥmh*: Ceresko relates this noun to Ugaritic *tḥm* ‘word, message’, and *bl’ ḥmh* ‘without an answer’ would echo *wl’ t‘nny* in v. 20a. This interpretation fits the overall structure of the poem very well (see analysis 4.4.5; cf. *'mdty/qmty*).

4.2 Content

How men and God have turned against Job.

- I–II Description of the harm done to Job mainly *by men*.
  - I Description of the outcasts who deride Job.
    - But now the children, whose fathers I despised, because they were gaunt from want, deride me (vv. 1–3a).
    - They gather their food in the wastelands (vv. 3b–4), and are barred from society (v. 5).
    - They live in the wilderness, too (vv. 6–8a), far away from civilization (v. 8b; cf. v. 5).
  - II The abasement and hostility Job experiences now from these outcasts.
    - II.1 But now those outcasts ridicule and humiliate me (vv. 9–10; cf. v. 1a).
      They conspire to cause my downfall (vv. 11–12b).
    - II.2 To them I am like a city which must be captured and on which they want to bring disaster (vv. 12c–15; siege metaphor).
- III–IV In vain *Job cries* to God about his misery. *God himself* is considered to be the *main cause* of this misery.
  - III The harm done to Job by God's hand notwithstanding his cry for help.
    - III.1 Job's miserable fate (he talks about God in the third person singular).
      - But now God continually visits me with diseases (vv. 16–17).
      - I am at death's door (vv. 18–19).
    - III.2 God himself is the cause of his suffering (he talks to God in the second person singular).
      - You do not listen to my cry for help, on the contrary, You contend with me (vv. 20–21).
      - You drive me to death (vv. 22–23; cf. vv. 18–19).
  - IV Job cries from the depths of despair into which he, in his opinion, has been thrown undeservedly.
    - IV.1 His readiness to help his neighbour in affliction.
      - Someone who is in distress you just help! (vv. 24–25).
      - So I did not expect this misery (vv. 26–27).

IV.2 His miserable fate.
From my distress I cry for help (vv. 28–29; cf. v. 28b with v. 20).
I am critically ill (cf. vv. 22–23) and all the pleasures of life have disappeared (vv. 30–31).

4.3 Transition markers

4.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

4.3.1.1 *w*- beginning line, v. 1a
‘th, v. 1a
w- beginning line, v. 9a
‘th, v. 9a
w- beginning line, v. 12c
w- beginning line, v. 16a
‘th, v. 16a
’k, v. 24a

4.3.1.2 no remarks

4.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

4.3.2.1 *gm*, v. 2a
gm, v. 8a

4.3.2.2 *lmh*, v. 2a
w- beginning line, v. 31a

4.3.3 Contrary indications

no remarks

4.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

4.4.1 General survey

’: *’l*, vv. 20, 22; *’m*, vv. 24, 25
b: *b*-, vv. 3, 3, 6, 18, 20, 21, 24, 24, 28, 28; *bw’*, vv. 26, 26; *byn* (‘between’)/*byn* (‘to understand’), vv. 7 and 20 resp.; *bkh*, vv. 25, 31; *bn*/*bt*, vv. 8, 8 and 29 resp.
g: *gm*, vv. 2, 8
h: *h*- (article), vv. 3, 4, 8; *hyh*, vv. 9, 9, 29, 31; -*hm*, vv. 2, 9; *hpk*, vv. 15, 21
y: -*y*, vv. 1, 1, 2, 10, 10, 11*, 11, 12, 12, 13, 13, 15 (3×), 16, 16, 17 (3×), 18, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, 30 (3×), 31, 31; *yd*, vv. 2, 21, 24; *ywm*, vv. 1, 16, 25, 27
k: *k*-, vv. 5, 14, 15, 15, 18, 19; -*k*, vv. 20, 21; *kḥ*, vv. 2, 18—see also *klḥ* in v. 2; *ky*, vv. 11, 23, 26
l: *l*-, vv. 1, 1, 2, 2, 4, 6, 9, 9, 13, 13, 19, 21, 21, 23, 24, 25, 25, 26, 29, 29, 31, 31; *l’*, vv. 10, 13, 17, 20, 24, 25, 27, 28

m: -*m*, vv. 1, 4, 9, 12; -*mw*, vv. 2, 5, 13; *mn*, vv. 1, 5, 8, 10, 10, 11, 17, 30—see also *mny* in v. 30
n: -*ny*, vv. 1, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 (3×), 23, 27; *npš*, vv. 16, 25
‘: *‘l*, vv. 1, 2, 5, 12, 12, 15, 16, 17, 30—see also *‘ly* in v. 4; *‘nh* (pi‘el ‘to oppress’)/*‘nh* (‘to answer’), vv. 11 and 20 resp.; *‘ny*, vv. 16, 27; *‘pr*, vv. 6, 19; *‘ṣm*, vv. 17, 21, 30; *‘rq*, vv. 3, 17; *‘th*, vv. 1, 9, 16
p: *pnh*, vv. 10, 11
q: *qwm*, vv. 12, 28
r: *rwḥ*, vv. 15, 22
ś: *śyḥ*, vv. 4, 7
š: *šw’*, vv. 3, 3, 14, 22; *šw‘*, vv. 20, 24*, 28; *šlḥ*, vv. 11, 12, 24
t: *tḥt*, vv. 7, 14

4.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 1–2: *‘ly*/*‘lymw*, vv. 1a and 2b resp. (alliteration)—inclusio
-*y*, vv. 1a.1d.2a; see also -*ny* in v. 1b
mmny lymym/*lmh ly*, vv. 1b and 2a resp. (alliter.)—inclusio
l-, vv. 1b.1d.2a (2×)
vv. 3–5: *h*- (article), vv. 3b.4a—exactly linear (Vetter, p. 49)
‘rqym/*qṭpym*, vv. 3b and 4a resp.—exactly linear (alliter.)
ṣyh/*śyḥ*, vv. 3b and 4a resp. (alliteration)—linear
vv. 6–8: *b‘rwṣ*/*byn*/*bny*, vv. 6a, 7a and 8a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
ḥry/*ḥrwl*, vv. 6b and 7b resp.—alliteration
vv. 9–10: *w*- beginning second colon, vv. 9b.10b
vv. 11–12b: *ptḥ*/*prḥḥ*, vv. 11a and 12a resp.—alliteration
šlḥw, vv. 11b.12b—linear
vv. 14–15: *k*-, vv. 14a.15b+c
vv. 16–17: *‘ly*, vv. 16a.17a
ywm/*lylh*, vv. 16b and 17a resp.
vv. 18–19: *k*-, vv. 18b.19b
vv. 20–21: -*k*, vv. 20a.21b!
b-, vv. 20b.21b
-*y*, vv. 20b.21a
vv. 22–23: *trkybny*/*tšybny*, vv. 22a and 23a resp. (alliter.)—linear
w- beginning second colon, vv. 22b.23b
vv. 24–25: *’k l’ b‘y yšlḥ yd*/*’m l’ bkyty lqšh ywm*, vv. 24a and 25a resp. (alliteration)—linear

’m, vv. 24b.25a!
vv. 30–31: *-y*, vv. 30a (2×)+b.31a+b
w‘ṣmy/*w‘gby*, vv. 30b and 31b resp. (alliteration)—exactly linear; note *w-* beginning second colon

4.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 9–12b (II.1): *w-* beginning second colon, vv. 9–10.11b—concat.
mpny, vv. 10b.11b!—concat.; see also *mn* in v. 10a
vv. 12c–15 (II.2): *‘ly*, vv. 12c.15a—inclusio
ntybty/*ndbty*, vv. 13a and 15b resp. (alliter.)—inclusio
lhwty/*blhwt*, vv. 13b and 15a resp. (alliter.)—linear
vv. 16–19 (III.1): *w-* beginning second colon, vv. 17b.19b—exactly lin.
vv. 20–23 (III.2): *’l*, vv. 20a.22a!—linear
l-, vv. 21a (2×).23b—linear
vv. 24–27 (IV.1): *ywm*, vv. 25a.27b—linear
-y, vv. 25b.27a—linear; see also *-ny* in v. 27b
vv. 28–31 (IV.2): *qdr*/*šḥr*, vv. 28a and 30a resp.—linear
hyh, vv. 29a.31a—linear
l-, vv. 29a+b.31a+b—linear
w- beginning second colon, vv. 29b.30–31—concat.
wr‘/*‘wry*, vv. 29b and 30a resp. (alliter.)—concat.

4.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–8 (canto I): *‘ly*/*‘ly*, vv. 1a and 4a resp.—alliteration
l-, vv. 1–2.6a
-m, vv. 1c.4b—linear
gm, vv. 2a.8a!—linear
‘lymw, vv. 2b.5b!—linear
b-, vv. 3a (2×).6a
h-, vv. 3b+4a.8b!
śyḥ, vv. 4a.7a!—linear
mn, vv. 5a.8b—linear; see also *mn* in v. 1b

vv. 9–15 (canto II): *w-* beginning line, vv. 9a.12c—exactly linear
-m, vv. 9a.12c—linear
l-, vv. 9b (2×).13b+c—linear
l’, vv. 10b.13c—linear
‘l, vv. 12a.12c—concatenatio; see also v. 15a

vv. 16–23 (canto III): *-ny*, vv. 16–23 except v. 17
‘ṣm, vv. 17a.21b—linear
l’, vv. 17b.20a—linear

vv. 24–31 (canto IV): *b-*, vv. 24a+b.28a+b—linear
šw‘, vv. 24b*.28b—exactly linear
bkh, vv. 25a.31b!
l’, vv. 27a.28a—concatenatio

4.4.5 Within the composition as a whole

vv. 1–5.9–12b.16–19.24–27: *w‘th*, vv. 1a.9a.16a!—exactly linear; see also *’k* and *’m l’* in vv. 24a and 25a resp.
‘ly, vv. 1a.16a+17a—linear
mmny/mny, vv. 1b.10a!—linear; see also *mn* in vv. 10b and 17a
ywm, vv. 1b.16b.25a+27b!; note *ymy ‘ny* in vv. 16b and 27b!
-m, vv. 1c+4b.9a
kḥ, vv. 2a.18a!; see also *klḥ* in v. 2b
yd, vv. 2a.24a—linear
-hm, vv. 2a.9b!—linear
lmh ly/lhm lmlh, vv. 2a and 9b resp. (alliteration)—linear
‘rq, vv. 3b.17b!
ky, vv. 11a.26a—exactly linear
šlḥ, vv. 11b+12b.24a!
npšy, vv. 16a.25b!—linear

vv. 6–8.12c–15.20–23.28–31: *ḥry … ḥrwl/ḥrh … ḥrp*, vv. 6b–7 and 30b resp.—alliteration
byn … bny nbl … bny bly/wttbnn by, vv. 7–8a and 20b resp.—alliteration
tḥt, vv. 7b.14b!—linear
bnym/bnwt, vv. 8a (2×) and 29b resp.!
š’h/tšwh, vv. 14b and 22b resp.; but cf. also *šw’* in v. 3c (2×)
hpk, vv. 15a.21a!
rwḥ, vv. 15b.22a!—linear
šw‘, vv. 20a.28b—linear

t‘nny/*y‘nh*, vv. 20a and 29b resp. (alliter.)—linear; see also *ḥmh* in v. 28a (cf. anal. 4.1)
‘mdty/*qmty*, vv. 20b and 28b resp.—exactly linear
b-, vv. 20b+21b.28a+b—linear
‘ṣm, vv. 21b.30b
w- // *w-* beginning second colon, vv. 22–23.30–31 —exactly linear; see also v. 29b

vv. 14–15.16–17: *‘ly*, vv. 15a.16a—concatenatio

note furthermore *l’* in the first strophe of a canticle; see vv. 10b, 13c, 17b, 20a, 24a+25a, 28a (but cf. also *l’* in v. 27a)

4.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

4.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
b- (v. 18), *hyh* (v. 9), *-y*, *yd* (v. 21), *k-* (v. 5), *ky* (v. 23), *l-*, *-mw* (v. 13), *-mn*, *-ny* (v. 11), *‘l* (v. 30), *šw’* (v. 3)

4.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*bw’*), *‘nh*/*‘nh*, *‘pr*, *qwm*

4.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...|1–2.3–8.9–14|15–19.20–24.25–26|27–31|... (...|2.6.6|5.5.2|5|...)
Stickel (1842): ...||1–4.5–8|9–11.12–15|16–19.20–23|24–26.27–31||... (...||4.4|3.4|4.4|3.5||...)
Schlottmann (1851): 1–2.3–4|5–6.7–8||9.10–11|12–13.14–15||16–17.18–19|20–21.22–23||24–25.26–27|28–29.30–31 (2.2|2.2||1.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2)
Ewald (1854): ...|1–8.9–15.16–23.24–31|... (...|4×8|...); similarly König (1929), RSV (1952)
Merx (1871): ...1–3a.3b–5a*.5b–7.8–10.11–13.14–15|16–19.20–23.24–27.28–31... (...6.6.5.6.6.5|4×8...)
Hitzig (1874): 1–8.9–15|16–20+22.23–31 (8.7|6.9)
Delitzsch (1876): 1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–19.20–23.24–27.28–31 (10.8.9.5×8)
Wright (1883): ...|2–4.5–8.9–11.12–14.15|16–19.20–23.24–25.26–28.29–31| ... (...|7.8.6.6.3|8.8.4.6.6|...)

Dillmann (1891): 1–2+4.5–8|9–12b.12c–15|16–19.20–23|24–27.28–31 (8.8|8.8|8.8|8.8)
Ley (1895): 1–3.4–7.8–11.12–15|16–19.20–23.24–27.28–31 (4×4|4×4)
Duhm (1897): ...||[2–3a.3b+4.3c+5.6–7a.7b–8].9–10.11–12.13–14a.14b–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23.24–25.26–27.28–29.30–31|...
Vetter (1897): ...|1–3a.3b–4.5–6.7–8|9–11.12–13.14–15|16–18|19–20.21–22||23||24–25|26–27.28–29.30–31|...
Hontheim (1904): 1–5.6–11||12–15||16–19.20–23|24–26+31.28–30+27 (6.6|4|8.8)
Budde (1913), pp. 176–77: 1–8.9–15|16–23.24–31
Schlögl (1916): 1–8.9–15.16–23.24–31 (4×16)
Löhr (1918): 9–15.16–23.24–31 (3×8)
Peters (1928): 1.2–4.5–6.7–8|9–11.12–13.14–15|16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23|24–25.26–27.28–29.30–31 (2.3.2.2|3.2.2|4×2|4×2)
Kissane (1939): ...2–8.9–14a.14b–19.20–25.26–31 (...5×6)
Möller (1955), p. 68: ...1–15|16–23.24–31|... (...16[!]|8.8|...)
Fohrer (1963): 1+9–10.[2b–8.]11–12a+12c–14.15b–19.20–23|24–27.28–31 (4.4.5.4|4.4)
Terrien (1963): 3–5.6–8|9–11.12–14|15–16.17–19|20–21.22–24|27–29.30–31
Skehan (1964): ...1–2.3–5.6–8||9–11.12–15a*.15b–c+18–19.20–22.23–26.16a+27b+17a+27a+28.29–31||... (...3.3.3||4×3.4.3.3||...); cf. NAB (1970)
Weiser (1968): 1–10.11–15.16–19.20–23.24–31; cf. Epping-Nelis (1968)
Andersen (1976): 1–8.9–15.16–23.24–31; similarly KBS (1980); cf. Ewald (1854), Budde (1913)
Gordis (1978), p. 540: 1–14.15–17.18–23.24–26.27–31 (a.b.c.d.b')
TOB (1978): 1–8.9–19.20–26.27–31
Ceresko (1980): 1.2–4.5–8.9–10.11–15.16–19.20–23.24–31
De Wilde (1981): ...1.2–3a*.3b–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11+15b–c|16–17.18–19|20–21.22–23.24–25.26–27.28–29.30–31|... ('drei Teile': vv. 1–8.9–11.15b–31; p. 291)
Van Selms (1983): ...|1–10.11–19.20–31|...
Rozelaar (1984): 1–8.9–15.16–23.24–26.27–31; cf. Andersen (1976)
Webster (1984): ...|1–2.3–5.6–8.9–11.12–15.16–19.20–23.24–26.27–31|... (...|4×3.4.4.4.3.5|...)
Habel (1985): 1.2–8.9–11|12–15|16–19||20–23|24–27|28–31 (a.b.c|a.b.c)
Bezuidenhout (1986): 1.2–4.5–8.9–10||11–14.15–17.18–19||20–22.23–25.26–27.28–31 (2.4.4.2|4.3.2|3.3.3.4)
Smick (1986), pp. 93–94: 1–10.11–15|16–17.18–19.20.21–23|24–26.27–31
Hartley (1988): 1–8.9–15|16–23|24–31; cf. Andersen (1976)

Lescow (1992), pp. 164–69: 1.9–11+15b–c.16–19|20–22|23–25.26–28.29–31
(4.8.8|6|6.6.6; a.b.a'—'ein klarer Aufbau des Kap.' [!], p. 169)

4.6 Comments and summary

Analysis 4.5 makes it clear that there was some consensus among earlier exegetes about the overall structure of ch. 30. Stickel distinguished in this poem *four* main units of about equal length: vv. 1–8, 9–15, 16–23 and 24–31. He was followed by Schlottmann, Ewald, Dillmann, Budde, Schlögl, Peters, König.[1] Presently we find the same division in Andersen, RSV and KBS; see also Rozelaar and Hartley (anal. 4.5). It is quite obvious that the beginnings of the first three units of this division are formally marked by the repetition of *w'th* ('but now'), 'anaphora' on the level of the cantos.[2] With this transition marker in vv. 1, 9 and 16 corresponds *'k l'* and *'m l'* (externally parallel) at the beginning of vv. 24 and 25 ('anaphora'). Other critics discerned only *two* main parts of about equal length: vv. 1–15 and 16–31; so Merx, Wright, Ley, Möller (see also Hitzig and Budde). Note that the disjunction between these parts coincides with that between Stickel's second and third units. Recent research, however, does not always give the identical transition marker *w'th* at the beginning of vv. 1, 9 and 16 (and *'k l'* in v. 24) much structural weight. This leads to an almost bewildering variety of opinions about the overall structure of ch. 30.[3] Such disregard of *w'th* as a formal indication of the beginning of a series of (almost) identical units is, in my view, evidence of an incomprehensible unawareness of the rhetorical structure of Hebrew poetry.[4]

I will make an attempt to prove that the earlier consensus as to the four main units of ch. 30 provides a fully satisfactory framework to describe the rhetorical structure of the poem. An analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as a whole reveals that the formal demarcation of the beginning of the first three main units (cantos) is not simply signalled by *w'th*; note furthermore *mmny/mny*, *ywm* ('day'), *'ny* ('affliction'), *yd*

---

[1] Cf. Hitzig, Vetter and Löhr (see anal. 4.5).

[2] 'Der durchgehende Gegensatz gegen die vorhergehende Strophe wird dadurch angedeutet, daß die 3 ersten Strophen sämmtlich mit einem nachdrücklichen *w'th* "jetzt aber" beginnen'; Schlottmann, p. 392. Cf. Budde (p. 176), König (p. 311) and Andersen (p. 235 n. 1: 'The three occurrences of *But now* ... mark the strophic structure').

[3] See Kissane, Fohrer, Terrien, Skehan, Weiser, Gordis, TOB, De Wilde, Van Selms, Habel, Bezuidenhout in anal. 4.5. Though, note already Köster in 1831 and Hontheim in 1904, too.

[4] Cf., e.g., Epping-Nelis: 'Hetzelfde begin (*wê'attāh*) in de vss 1, 9 en 16 doet vele auteurs aan strofen denken. De logische ideeëngang wijst eerder op een indeling 1–10; 11–23; 24–31' (p. 133).

('hand'), suffix *-hm*, *šlḥ* ('to let loose, to stretch out'), *npšy* ('my soul') in anal. 4.4.5. Especially the responsions *šlḥ* and *yd* prove that v. 24 represents the first line of the fourth unit. The end of these cantos is formally marked by the responsions *tḥt* ('under'), *š'h/tšwh*, *rwḥ* ('wind'), and *w- // w-* at the beginning of the second colon in the final strophe of cantos III and IV (anal. 4.4.5). Anal. 4.4.5 shows furthermore that these formal relationships are not confined to the beginning and end of the cantos as such.

This formal demarcation of the cantos perfectly matches the progression of ideas in the poem; see analysis 4.2. The first canto (vv. 1–8) is almost totally devoted to a description of the outcasts. These outcasts are deriding Job, as the first colon of this unit states (v. 1a). The second canto (vv. 9–15), then, is to be viewed as an elaboration of v. 1a. It deals with the hostility Job experiences *from the outcasts.* In v. 11a God is momentarily the subject of Job's affliction; note the singular verb forms *ptḥ* and *wy'nny.* Therefore, contemporary critics are inclined to take v. 11 as the beginning of a new main unit within the poem (Weiser, Epping-Nelis, Van Selms; cf. also Fohrer, Habel and Smick).[5] V. 11a, however, is only a 'casual' reference to the ultimate cause of Job's afflictions in a context of plural verb forms (see vv. 10 and 11b–14), which have the outcasts of canto I as their subject.[6] In the third canto (vv. 16–23) the outcasts do no longer play a part in connection with Job's misery. Now, God is accused of afflicting Job with diseases. The canto winds up with a well-known device of closure, a reference to Job's impending death; note *mwt* ('death') in v. 23a. The beginning of the fourth canto (vv. 24–31) is marked by a reference to Job's righteousness (vv. 24–25) and concludes (again) with an elaborated allusion to his impending death (vv. 28–31).[7]

The cantos, taken two by two, form supercantos of a sort (anal. 4.2). Cantos I–II (vv. 1–15) deal with the enmity Job experiences from men, and cantos III–IV (vv. 16–31) with that he experiences from God.[8] The end of the first 'supercanto' is probably marked by the tricolon of v. 15. In this line Job explicitly refers to his previous dignity and well-being; note *ndbty* and *yšʿty*. This reference represents a linear correspondence (some kind of refrain) with the allusion to Job's previous happiness in the final line of canto IV, v. 31; note *knry* ('my lyre') and *ʿgby* ('my flute'). According to Habel's design the poem falls into vv. 1–19 and 20–31. The first half is marked by the threefold 'but now', while the latter by a form of the verb *šwʿ* (vv. 20, 24, 28), which introduces 'three balanced units' (p. 417). This partition has the drawback that it cuts through the description of God tormenting Job in vv. 17–19 and 21–23.[9]

---

[5] According to Van Selms it is not difficult to divide the poem into several main parts. In the second part (vv. 11–19), then, *God* is supposed to be the cause of Job's misery; cf. Epping-Nelis. Habel supposes that in vv. 12–15 the 'terrors of death' are attacking Job (note *blhwt* in v. 15a).

[6] Westermann correctly takes vv. 1–15 as a coherent unit, which he characterizes as 'Verklagen *der Feinde*' (italics are mine; PvdL); Westermann (1978), p. 61.

[7] Budde correctly notes that the regular structure of the poem forms 'ein starkes Gegengewicht gegen den naheliegenden Verdacht, daß in dem Hauptbestande des ersten Abschnitts, der wirklich abschweifenden Schilderung der Pariakaste des Landes, ein Einschub vorläge' (p. 177); see also Westermann (1978), p. 61 n. 3 (against Bickell, Duhm, Fohrer). This observation also speaks against the elimination of vv. 12–15a by De Wilde, and furthermore militates against Budde's own view, that vv. 27 and 30 represent secondary insertions; cf. also Westermann (1978), p. 64 n. 3.

[8] See also Merx, Hitzig, Wright, Ley, Budde and Möller in anal. 4.5. According to

From a thematic point of view cantos III and IV clearly fall into two identical canticles, vv. 16–19.20–23 and vv. 24–27.28–31 respectively. The beginning of canticle III.2 is marked by the direct address to God, which dominates the canticle as a whole (vv. 20–23). In canticle III.1 (vv. 16–19) Job speaks about God in the third person. This division is reinforced by the responsio *ʿṣm* ('bone') in anal. 4.4.4. Canticle IV.2 distinguishes itself from canticle IV.1 by the fact that the former in its entirety deals with Job's impending death. This reality forms a glaring contrast with Job's previous expectations of a happy life, as described in canticle IV.1. The description of Job's physical pains in vv. 27a and 30 constitutes a semantic responsio at the end of the canticles. These thematic considerations are further corroborated by the responsions within canticles IV.1 and IV.2 themselves; note *ywm* ('day') and *hyh* ('to be') in anal. 4.4.3. I assume that the second canto also pertains to this bipartite structure; see anal. 4.2 and 4.4.3–4, and note especially *w-* beginning a line in anal. 4.4.4. Canticle II.1 also winds up with the device of epiphora; see *šlḥw* in vv. 11b and 12b.[10] The first canto displays a different structure. The canto divides into three identical strophes of three lines, vv. 1–3a, 3b–5 and 6–8 (cf. Skehan and Webster). The responsions in these strophes constitute a *parallelismus stropharum*; note suffix *-m*, *gm*, *ʿlymw*, *śyḥ*, *mn* in anal. 4.4.4 (cf. the same phenomenon at the beginning of the preceding poem, 29,2–6). The four-line canticles of cantos II–IV fall into two strophes of two lines each; see anal. 4.2 and 4.4.2–3.[11]

Ley, vv. 1–15 portray 'Hiobs Bedrängnisse von außen her', and vv. 16–31 'die an seiner Person haftenden Leiden' (p. 675).

[9] Habel's proposal furthermore fails to integrate vv. 2–8, because the verses are taken as an *excursus*, which presents a portrait of the outcasts. And finally, his division is based on a selective use of verbal repetitions.

[10] For the four-line canticles in cantos II–IV see also Dillmann (!); for the four-line canticles in cantos III–IV also Schlottmann, Merx, Delitzsch, Ley and Habel (cf. Hontheim).

[11] See for the two-line strophes in vv. 9–31 also Duhm and Peters; for the two-line strophes in vv. 16–31 also Schlottmann and De Wilde (anal. 4.5).

The *main thought* of the poem is formulated in the final lines of cantos II and IV, vv. 15 and 31 (cf. above on the semantic responsio between these verses). These lines concisely formulate *the contrast between Job's former dignity and enjoyment and his present misery.* V. 15 closes the description of the hostility Job experiences from men, v. 31 the description of God as Job's ultimate enemy. Job's present situation is entirely opposed to his previous position, in which he was blessed by God and men, as described in the preceding poem. The contrast is intensified by the symmetrical design of the successive chapters; note God—men (ch. 29) <> men—God (ch. 30). The contrast between the two situations is furthermore emphazised by the transition marker *w'th* ('but now') at the beginning of cantos I–III. From a formal viewpoint the connection between chs. 29 and 30 is founded on the roots *śḥq* ('to laugh') in 30,1a and 29,24a (concatenatio), and *'bl* ('to mourn') in 30,31a and 29,25c (cf. anal. 3.1 above; responsio).

5 Job’s last speech (3): Job 31

Structure: 12.16.12 > 6.6|6.5.5|6.6 > 2.2.2|2.2.2||3.3|3.2|3.2||2.2.2|3.3

I.1 [1] *bryt krty l*‘**yny**   *WMH ’tbwnn ‘l btwlh*
[2] *WMH ḥlq ’LWH mm‘l*   *wnḥlt ŠDY mmrmym*

[3] *HL’ ’yd l‘wl*   *wnkr lp‘ly ’wn*
[4] *HL’ hw’ yr’h drky*   *wkl Ṣ‘DY YSPWR*

[5] *’m hlkty ‘m šw’*   *wtḥš ‘l mrmh rgly*
[6] *yšqlny bm’zny ṣdq*   *wyd‘* ’LWH *tmty*

I.2 [7] ’M *tṭh ’šry mny hdrk*   *w’ḥr* **‘yny** *hlk LBY*   *wbkpy dbq m’wm*
[8] *’zr‘h w’ḥr* Y’KL   *wṣ’ṣ’y* YŠRŠW

[9] ’M *NPTH LBY ‘l ’šh*   *w‘l ptḥ r‘y ’rbty*
[10] *tṭḥn l’ḥr ’šty*   *w‘lyh ykr‘wn ’ḥryn*

[11] *ky HW’ zmh*   *why’ ‘WN PLYLY*
[12] *ky ’š hy’ ‘d ’bdwn T’KL*   *wbkl tbw’ty* TŠRŠ

II.1 [13] ’M *’m’s mšpṭ ‘bdy*   *w’mty brbm ‘mdy*
[14] *WMH ’‘śh ky yqwm ’L*   *wky ypqd MH ’šybnw*
[15] *HL’ b*BṬN *‘śny ‘śhw*   *wyknnw brḥm ’ḥd*

[16] ’M *’mn‘ mḥpṣ dlym*   *w‘yny ’lmnh ’klh*
[17] *w’kl pty lbdy*   *wl’ ’kl ytwm mmnh*
[18] *ky mn‘wry gdlny k’b*   *wm*BṬN *’my ’nḥnh*

II.2 [19] **’m ’r’h** *’wbd mbly lbwš*   *w’yn kswt l’bywn*
[20] **’m** *l’ brkwny ḥlṣw*   *wmgz kbśy ytḥmm*
[21] **’m** *hnypwty ‘l ytwm ydy*   *ky* **’r’h** *bš‘r ‘zrty*

[22] *ktpy mškmh tpwl*   *w’zr‘y mqnh tšbr*
[23] *ky pḥd ’ly ’yd* **’l**   *wmś’tw l’ ’wkl*

II.3 [24] **’m** *śmty zhb ksly*   *wlktm ’mrty mbṭḥy*
[25] **’m** *’śmḥ ky rb ḥyly*   *wky kbyr mṣ’h ydy*
[26] **’m ’r’h** *’wr ky yhl*   *wyrḥ yqr hlk*

	27	*wYPT bstr LBY*	*wtšq ydy lpy*	
	28	*gm HW’ ‘WN PLYLY*	*ky kḥšty l’*1 *mm‘l*	
III.1	29	’M *’śmḥ bpyd mśn’y*	*wht‘rrty ky mṣ’w r‘*	
	30	*Wl’ ntty lḥṭ’ ḥky*	*lš’l b’lh npšw*	
	31	’M *l’ ’mrw mty ’hly*	*my ytn mbśrw l’ nśb‘*	
	32	*bḥwṣ l’ ylyn gr*	*dlty l’rḥ* ’PTḤ	
	33	’M *ksyty k’***dm** *pš‘y*	*lṭmwn bḥby ‘wny*	
	34	*ky ’‘rwṣ hmwn rbh*	*wbwz mšpḥwt yḥtny*	*w’dm l’* **’ṣ’** PTḤ
III.2	35	*my ytn ly šm‘ ly*	*hn twy ŠDY y‘nny*	*wSPR ktb ’yš ryby*
	36	*’m l’ ‘l škmy ’ś’nw*	*’‘ndnw ‘ṭrwt ly*	
	37	*MSPR Ṣ‘DY ’gydnw*	*kmw ngyd ’qrbnw*	
	38	*’m ‘ly* **’dmt***y tz‘q*	*wyḥd tlmyh ybkywn*	
	39	*’m kḥh ’KLTY bly ksp*	*wnpš b‘lyh hpḥty*	
	40	*tḥt ḥṭh* **yṣ’** *ḥwḥ*	*wtḥt ś‘rh b’šh*	

5.1 Text

V. 1b—*btwlh*: ‘virgin’ (so Budde, Dhorme, Fohrer, Habel, Hartley among others). Michel, Ceresko, Freedman (*JBL* 102 [1983], p. 143) and Smick interpret this noun as ‘the Virgin (Anat)’. The first canto (vv. 1–12), however, does not deal with idolatry (cf. v. 26). According to vv. 7 and 9 it is rather ‘lust’ (sexual sins, adultery) which constitutes the theme of this unit.

V. 5a—*’m*: the particle introduces here an oath with suppression of the imprecation and means ‘(certainly) not’ (GKC § 149); so also in vv. 13, 16, 29 and 33. In vv. 7, 9, 19–21, (24–26), 38–39, to the contrary, *’m* is each time followed by an imprecation.

V. 11b—*plyly*: cf. v. 28a; MT *plylym* (‘judges’). But perhaps the *-m* in MT is to be recognized as the enclitic particle (Gordis, Ceresko).

V. 13b—*w’mty*: with most scholars and versions I take this word as the beginning of the second colon—enjambement (cf. the comment on Job 29,14a; anal. 3.1). In MT, however, *w’mty* bears the principal distinctive accent of the poetic line. When this accent is transferred to the preceding word *‘bdy*, then (as usual in this chapter), the second colon opens with *w-*. This phenomenon and the length of the poetic lines in vv. 7, 34 and 35 speaks against the view of Ceresko, who takes v. 13 as a tricolon.

V. 15b—*wyknnw*: MT reads imperf. qal + suff. 3 masc. sing. We must probably revocalize the form to a polel + suff. 1 pl. (‘He fashioned us’), the resulting three *n*’s contracted to two (cf. GKC § 72cc).

5.2 Content

For the last time Job proclaims his innocence.

- I About lust.
  - I.1 General affirmation of Job's righteousness.
    - For fear of God I did not lust for a maiden (vv. 1–2).
    - He would surely punish my evil deeds (vv. 3–4).
    - If He should judge my comings and goings, then, my innocence would be proved (vv. 5–6).
  - I.2 The punishments which may be imposed on him if evidence to the contrary (lust; cf. v. 1) should be provided.
    - If I have sinned with my eyes (cf. v. 1a) may somebody else enjoy the crop of my fields (vv. 7–8).
    - If I have gazed on my neighbour's wife may somebody else possess my wife (vv. 9–10).
    - That would be a deathly, *criminal offence* (vv. 11–12).
- II About unfaithfulness to one's neighbour (II.1–2) and to God (II.3).
  - II.1 Affirmation of Job's social righteousness.
    - I have never despised the cause of my servants, because I could not account for that before God (vv. 13–15; cf. vv. 1–2).
    - I have always supported the poor (vv. 16–18).
  - II.2 The punishments which may be imposed on him if evidence to the contrary (social injustice) should be provided.
    - If I have not given clothes to the poor (vv. 19–21),
    - then, may my arm become unserviceable (vv. 22–23).
  - II.3 'The punishments which may be imposed on him if evidence to the contrary (denial of God) should be provided'.
    - If I should have relied on great wealth (vv. 24–25) or on other 'idols' (v. 26),
    - then, I would be guilty of secret sins and of a *criminal offence* (vv. 27–28; cf. vv. 11–12).
- III Summary/conclusion.
  - III.1 Affirmation of Job's righteousness.
    - I did not enjoy the ruin of my enemy (vv. 29–30; about secret sins, cf. canto I).
    - I have always offered hospitality to travellers (vv. 31–32; about social justice, cf. canto II).
    - I did not hide sins because I feared the contempt of men (vv. 33–34; cf. canto I).
  - III.2 The punishments which may be imposed on him if evidence to the contrary is provided.

I wish to justify myself in front of God (vv. 35–37).
If I have failed with regard to the stewardship of my land, then, may weeds grow on it instead of corn (vv. 38–40; cf. II.2).

5.3 Transition markers

5.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

5.3.1.1 *mh*, v. 1b; ext. // with *mh* in v. 2a
h- interr., v. 3a; ext. // *h-* interr. in v. 4a
hw', v. 11a
w- beginning line, v. 27a
my ytn, v. 31b
my ytn, v. 35a
hn, v. 35b

5.3.1.2 *'mr*, v. 24b

5.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

5.3.2.1 *hy'*, v. 12a; ext. // *hy'* in v. 11b
gm, v. 28a

5.3.2.2 *h-* interr., v. 15a
hw', v. 28a

5.3.3 Contrary indications

w- beginning line, v. 2a
hw', v. 4a
cohortative: *'zrʿh*, v. 8a
w- beginning line, v. 14a
mh, v. 14a
mh, v. 14b
w- beginning line, v. 17a
w- beginning line, v. 30a
'mr, v. 31a

5.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

5.4.1 General survey

': *'bd*, vv. 12, 19; *'dm*, vv. 33, 38; *'ḥr*, vv. 7, 8, 10, 10; *'yd*, vv. 3, 23; *'kl*, vv. 8, 12, 17, 17, 39; *'l* ('God'), vv. 14, 23, 28; *'lwh*, vv. 2, 6; *'m*, vv. 5, 7, 9, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 33, 36, 38, 39; *'mr*, vv. 24, 31; *'šh*, vv. 9, 10—see also *'yš* in v. 35
b: *b-*, vv. 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 15, 21, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33; *bṭn*, vv. 15, 18; *bly*, vv. 19, 39
d: *drk*, vv. 4, 7
h: *h-* interr., vv. 3, 4, 15; *-h*, vv. 10, 17, 18, 22, 22, 38, 39, 39; *hw'*, vv. 4, 11, 28; *hy'*, vv. 11, 12; *hlk*, vv. 5, 7, 26
w: *-w*, vv. 20, 23, 29, 30, 31

y: -*y*, vv. 1, 4, 4, 5, 6, 7 (4×), 8, 9, 9, 10, 12, 13 (3×), 17, 17, 18, 18, 20, 21, 21, 22, 22, 23, 24, 24, 25, 25, 27 (3×), 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 (3×), 35 (4×), 36, 36, 37, 38, 38; *yd*, vv. 21, 25, 27; *yṣ'*, vv. 8, 34, 40; *ytwm*, vv. 17, 21

k: *k*-, vv. 18, 33, 37; *ky*, vv. 11, 12, 14, 14, 18, 21, 23, 25, 25, 26, 28, 29, 34; *kl*, vv. 4, 12; *ksh*, vv. 19, 33

l: *l*-, vv. 1, 3, 3, 10, 17, 19, 24, 27, 28, 30, 30, 32, 33, 35, 35, 36; *l'*, vv. 3, 4, 15, 17, 20, 23, 30, 31, 31, 32, 34, 36; *lb*, vv. 7, 9, 27

m: *mh*, vv. 1, 2, 14, 14; *my*, vv. 31, 35; *mn*, vv. 2, 2, 16, 17, 18, 18, 19, 20, 22, 22, 23, 28, 31—see also *mny* in v. 7; *m'l*, vv. 2, 28; *mṣ'*, vv. 25, 29

n: *ngd*, vv. 37, 37; -*nw* (3 sing.), vv. 14, 15 (1 pl.?), 36, 36, 37, 37; -*ny*, vv. 6, 15, 18, 20, 34, 35; *npš*, vv. 30, 39; *nś'*, vv. 23, 36; *ntn*, vv. 30, 31, 35

s: *spr*, vv. 4, 35, 37

': *'wn*, vv. 11, 28, 33; *'yṅ*, vv. 1, 7, 16; *'l*, vv. 1, 5, 9, 9, 10, 21, 36, 38; *'m*/*'md*-, vv. 5 and 13 resp.; *'śh*, vv. 14, 15, 15

p: *pll*, vv. 11, 28; *pth*, vv. 9, 27; *ptḥ*, vv. 9, 32, 34

ṣ: *ṣ'd*, vv. 4, 37

r: *r'h*, vv. 4, 19, 21, 26; *rb*, vv. 25, 34; *ryb*, vv. 13, 35

ś: *śmḥ*, vv. 25, 29

š: *šdy*, vv. 2, 35; *škm*, vv. 22, 36; *šrš*, vv. 8, 12

t: *tḥt*, vv. 40, 40

5.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 1–2: *wmh*, vv. 1b.2a
'l/*m'l*, vv. 1b and 2a resp.
vv. 3–4: *hl'*, vv. 3a.4a—exactly linear (anaphora; Vetter, p. 49)
vv. 7–8: *w'ḥr*/*w'ḥr*, vv. 7b and 8a resp.
vv. 9–10: *'šh*, vv. 9a.10a!—linear
w'l, vv. 9b.10b—exactly linear; see also *'l* in v. 9a
vv. 11–12: *ky*, vv. 11a.12a—exactly linear (anaphora; Vetter, p. 49)
hy', vv. 11b.12a!; see also *hw'* in v. 11a
vv. 13–15: *'śh*, vv. 14a.15a (2×)!
-*nw* (3 sing.)/-*nw* (1 pl.?), vv. 14b and 15b resp.; see also -*hw* in v. 15a
vv. 16–18: *'m 'mn' mḥps*/*'my 'nḥnh*, vv. 16a and 18b resp. (alliter.)—inclusio

’lmnh/ytwm, vv. 16b and 17b resp.
’klh/w’kl . . . ’kl, vv. 16b and 17 resp.—alliteration
mmnh/’nḥnh, vv. 17b and 18b resp.—linear (‘rhyme’); see also *’klh* in v. 16b
vv. 19–21: *’m*, vv. 19a.20a.21a—exactly linear (anaphora; Vetter, p. 49)
’r’h, vv. 19a.21b—inclusio
vv. 22–23: *ktpy/ky pḥd*, vv. 22a and 23a resp. (alliter.)—linear
vv. 24–26: *’m*, vv. 24a.25a.26a—exactly linear (anaphora)
ky, vv. 25a+b.26a
vv. 27–28: *l-*, vv. 27b.28b
lpy/plyly, vv. 27b and 28a resp.—alliteration
vv. 31–32: *l’*, vv. 31a+b.32a
vv. 33–34: *k’dm/w’dm*, vv. 33a and 34c resp.—alliteration
vv. 35–37: *ly*, vv. 35a (2×).36b
spr, vv. 35c.37a—inclusio
-nw, vv. 36a+b.37a+b; note *-nw* in vv. 36a and 37a—linear
vv. 38–40: *’m*, vv. 38a.39a—exactly linear (anaphora)
-h, vv. 38b.39a+b

5.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 1–6 (I.1): *l-*, vv. 1a.3a+b—linear
‘l, vv. 1b.5b—linear; cf. also *m‘l* in v. 2a
’lwh, vv. 2a.6b!—linear
‘wl . . . ’wn/šw’ . . . mrmh, vv. 3 and 5 resp.—linear
drk/hlk . . . rgl, vv. 4a and 5 resp.—concatenatio
vv. 7–12 (I.2): *’m*, vv. 7a.9a—exactly linear
lby, vv. 7b.9a—linear
’ḥr, vv. 7b+8a.10a+b!
m’wm/zmh . . . ‘wn, vv. 7c and 11 resp.—linear
’kl, vv. 8a.12a—exactly linear (cf. Ceresko, p. 104)
šrš, vv. 8b.12b!—exactly linear (cf. Ceresko, p. 104)
’šty/ky ’š hy’, vv. 10a and 12a resp. (alliter.)—linear
vv. 13–18 (II.1): *’* + *m* sound, vv. 13 and 16 (alliter.)—linear
’m, vv. 13a.16a—exactly linear
w- beginning line, vv. 14a.17a—exactly linear
bṭn, vv. 15a.18b!—linear; see alo *rḥm* in v. 15b!
-ny, vv. 15a.18a—linear
vv. 19–23 (II.2): *ky*, vv. 21b.23a—linear
bš‘r ‘zrty/w’zr‘y . . . tšbr, vv. 21b and 22b resp. (alliter.)—concatenatio

vv. 24–28 (II.3): *ky*, vv. 25a+b+26a.28b—linear
ydy, vv. 25b.27b
vv. 29–34 (III.1): *’m*, vv. 29a.31a.33a—exactly linear
ky, vv. 29b.34a—inclusio
ntn, vv. 30a.31b—concatenatio
ptḥ, vv. 32b.34c—exactly linear
vv. 35–40 (III.2): *’m*, vv. 36a.38a+39a
‘l, vv. 36a.38a

5.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–12 (canto I): *‘yny*, vv. 1a.7b!—linear
mn/mny, vv. 2a+b and 7a resp.—linear
šw’ … *mrmh/zmh* … *‘wn*, vv. 5 and 11 resp.—exactly linear
hw’, vv. 4a.11a
dřk, vv. 4a.7a!
kl, vv. 4b.12b!
’m, vv. 5a.7a+9a
hlk, vv. 5a.7b

vv. 13–28 (canto II): *’m*, vv. 13a+16a.19–21.24–26
wl’ ’kl/l’ ’wkl, vv. 17b and 23b resp. (alliter.)—linear; see also *w’kl* in v. 17a
ytwm, vv. 17b.21a!
-h, vv. 17b+18b.22a+b—linear
ky, vv. 18a.23a—exactly linear; see also *gm* in v. 28a(!) and *ky* in v. 28b
’r’h, vv. 19a+21b.26a—linear
ydy, vv. 21a.25b+27b!
’l (‘God’), vv. 23a.28b!—linear; see also prep. *’l* in v. 23a and *’l* (‘God’) in v. 14a

vv. 29–40 (canto III): *’m*, vv. 29a+31a+33a.36a+38a+39a; note *’m l’* in vv. 31a and 36a
npšw/wnpš, vv. 30b and 39b resp.! (alliter.)—‘inclusio’
my ytn, vv. 31b.35a!; see also *ntn* in v. 30a!
’dm, vv. 33a.38a!—linear; see also *w’dm* in v. 34c
-ny, vv. 34b.35b—concatenatio
yṣ’, vv. 34c.40a—linear

5.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 1–6.35–37, ‘inclusio’:	*šdy*, vv. 2b.35b!; see also *’lwh* in vv. 2a and 6b! *ṣ‘dy*, vv. 4b.37a! (Ceresko, Habel) *spr*, vv. 4b.35c+37a! (Ceresko, Habel) chiasm
vv. 1–2.27–28, ‘inclusio’:	*’lwh mm‘l/ ’l mm‘l*, vv. 2a and 28b resp.!
vv. 1–6.13–18.29–34:	*wmh*, vv. 1b+2a.14a!—linear; see also *mh* in v. 14b! *w-* beginning line, vv. 2a.14a.30a—exactly linear; see also v. 17 *’lwh/ ’l*, vv. 2a and 14a resp.—linear; cf. also *’lwh* in v. 6b! *hl’*, vv. 3a+4a.15a! *‘m/ ‘md*, vv. 5a and 13b resp.! *šw’ . . . mrmh/pš‘ . . . ‘wn*, vv. 5 and 33 resp. —exactly linear *ṣdq/mšpṭ*, vv. 6a and 13a resp.!
vv. 7–12.24–28.35–40:	*hlk*, vv. 7b.26b—linear; but cf. also *hlk* in v. 5a *lby*, vv. 7b+9a.27a! *yṣ’*, vv. 8b.40a *pth*, vv. 9a.27a! *’šh/ ’yš*, vv. 9a+10a and 35c resp.! *tṭḥn/tḥt ḥṭh*, vv. 10a and 40a resp.—alliter. *hw’*, vv. 11a.28a—linear; see also *hy’* in vv. 11–12 (but cf. *hw’* in v. 4a) *‘wn plyly*, vv. 11b.28a!—linear; see also *zmh* in v. 11a and *kḥš* in v. 28b *’kl*, vv. 12a.39a—linear; see also *’kl* in v. 8a *zhb . . . ktm/ksp*, vv. 24 and 39a resp.!
vv. 7–12.19–23.35–40:	*’zr‘h/w’zr‘y*, vv. 8a and 22b resp.—alliter. *’bd*, vv. 12a.19a! *bly*, vv. 19a.39a! *škm*, vv. 22a.36a! *nś’*, vv. 23b.36a!

vv. 24–28.29–30, concatenatio: *'m 'śmḥ* + root *mṣ'*, vv. 25.29!
w- beginning line, vv. 27a.30a

5.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

5.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
-h (v. 10), *-y*, *l-*, *l'*, *-ny*, *'yn* (v. 16), *'l*, *ptḥ* (v. 9), *r'h* (v. 4)

5.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
'yd, *'mr*, *b-*, *-w*, *k-*, *ksh*, *mn*, *m'l*, (*ngd*), *rb*, *ryb*, (*tḥt*)

5.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...|1–4.5–8.9–12|13–15.16–18.19–20+32.21–23|29–31.38–40b.33–34.24–25.26–28.35–37 (...|3×4|4×3|3.3.2.2.3.3)

Stickel (1842): ...||1–4.5–8.9–12|13–15.16–18|19–23.24–28|29–30.31–32.33–34|35–37.38–40 (...||3×4|3.3|5.5|3×2|3.3)

Schlottmann (1851): 1–2.3–4|5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12||13–15.16–18.19–21.22–23||24–25.26–28|29–30.31–32.33–34|35–37.38–40 (2.2|2.2|2.2||3×3.2||2.3|3×2|3.3)

Ewald (1854): ...||1–6.7–12|13–18.19–23|24–28.29–34.35–40 (...||6.6|6.6*|6*.6.6)

Merx (1871): ...1–4.5–8a.9–12|13–15.16–18.19–20.21–23.24–25.26–28.29–30.31–32.38–40b.33–35a.35b–37 (...3×8|6.6.4.6.4.6.4.4.6.6.6)

Hitzig (1874): 1–4|5–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–20|21–23.24+26–28.29+31.33–34.35–36.38–40 (4.16.16 > 4|4.4.3.3.2|3.4.2.2.2.3)

Delitzsch (1876): 1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–23.24–28.29–30.31–32.33–34.35–37.38–40 (8.9.8.6.6.10.10.4.4.5.7.6)

Wright (1883): ...|1–3.4–6.7–8.9–12|13–15.16–18.19–23.24–28|29–31.32+34+33.38–40b.35–37 (6.6.5.8|6.6.10.10|6.7.6.7)

Dillmann (1891): 1–4.5–8|9–12.13–15|16–18.19–23|24–28.29–32|33–34.35–37.38–40 (8.9|8.6|6.10|10.8|5.7.6; 'Eine strenge Disposition ist nicht durchgeführt .... Dem entspricht, dass auch die Stichenzahl der Absätze ungleichmässiger ist als sonst .... Die Vermuthung, dass die urspr. Ordnung ... gestört sei, liegt nahe;' [p. 264])

Ley (1895): 1–4.5+7–8.9–12.13+6+14–15|16–18.19–20.21–23.24–25.26–28|29–32.33–34*.38–40b.35–37 (4×4|3.2.3.2.3|4.3[?].3.4)

Duhm (1897): ...|1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13+15.16–17.14+18.19–20.21–22.24–25.26–27.28+23.29–30.31–32.38+40b.33–34.35*.36–37

Vetter (1897): ...|1–2.3–4|5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12|13–15|16–18.19–21.22–23|24–25|26–28|29–30|31–32|33–34|38–40b|35–37

Hontheim (1904): 1–4.5–8|9–12|13–15.38–40b|29–32|19–20+16–18.21–25|26–28|33–34*.35–37 (4.4|4|3.3|4|5.5|3|3.3)

Schlögl (1916): 1–12.13–23|24–32.33–34+38–40b+35–37 (22.22|18.18)

Löhr (1918): 5–6.7a–b+8.9–10.13+15|16–17.14+18.19–20.21–22|24+23.26+28.29–30.31–31|33–40* (4×2|4×2|4×2|4×2)

Peters (1928): 1–2.3–4|5–6.7–8.38–40b.9–10.11–12.13–15.16–18.19–21.22–23.24–25.26–28.29–30.31–32.33–34|35–37 (2.2|2.2.3.2.2.3.3.3.2.2.3.2.2.2|3)

Kissane (1939): 27,2–6.31,1–6.7–10+12.13–18.19–23.24–27+28b–30.31–32+38–40b.33–37 (5.6.5.6.5.6.5.6)

Möller (1955), p. 68: . . . |1–6.7–12.13–20.21–28.29–34.35–40 (. . . |6.6.8.8.6.6)

Fohrer (1963): 1–4.5–7b+8.9–12.13–15.16–19.20–23.24–28.29–32.33–34b+38–40b|35–37* (3×4.3.4.4.5.4.5|4)

Terrien (1963): 30,25–26.31,1–4|5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12*|13–15.16–18|19–20.21–23|24–25.26–28|29–32.33–34|35–37.38–40

Skehan (1964): . . . ||2–4+6|5+7–8.38–40b.1+9–10.11–12|13–15.16–18.19–21.22–23|24–25.26–28.29–30.31–32.33–34|35a+35c–37+35b (. . . ||4.11.11.11.3 > . . . ||4|3×3.2|3×3.2|2.3.3×2|3); cf. NAB (1970)

Andersen (1976): 1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–23.24–25.26–28.29–30.31–32.33–34.35–37.38–40; cf. RSV (1952)

TOB (1978): 1–6.7–15.16–22.23–34|35–37.38–40

Ceresko (1980), note pp. 102–04: 1–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–21.22–23.24–28.29–30.31–32.33–34.35–37.38–40

KBS (1980): 1–12.13–15.16–18.19–23.24–28.29–40

De Wilde (1981): . . . |1–2.3–4. etc. (see Duhm [1897]).31–32.33–34.38–40|35*.36–37

Van Selms (1983): 'hfst. 31 kan niet in perikopen verdeeld worden' ('ch. 31 cannot be divided into parts', p. 75); cf. König (1929)

Rozelaar (1984): 1–4.5–6.7–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–20.21–23.24–25.26–28.29–30.31–32.33–34.38–40b.35–37

Webster (1984): 1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–22.23–25.26–28.29–31.32–34.35–37.38–40

Habel (1985): 1–6.7–12.13–23.24–28.29–34.35–40 (vv. 1–3.4–6.7–34.35–37.38–40 > a.b.c.b'.a')

Bezuidenhout (1986): 1–4.5–6.7–8.9–12||13–15.16–18.19–20.21–23||24–25.26–28.29–30.31–32||33–34.35.36–37.38–40 (4.2.2.4||3.3.2.3||2.3.2.2||3×2.3)

Smick (1986), pp. 94–97: 1–4|5–6.7–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–20.21–23|24.25.26–28.29.30.31–32.33–34|35–37|38–40; cf. Rozelaar (1984)

Hartley (1988): 1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–23.24–28.29–32.33–34.38–40b|35–37

Lescow (1992), pp. 170–79: 1-4||5–6.7a–b+8||9–10.13–14|16+19–22|24–25|26-27.29–30||31–32.33–34b||35–37 (8||4.4||4.4|5×2|2.2|4.4||4.4||7; a.b.c.b'.a')

5.6 Comments and summary

On the face of it Job's extensive oath of innocence in ch. 31 seems somewhat shapeless, rhetorically speaking, because the series of vows appear to be rather unsystematically connected with each other. Habel notes that the design of this composition 'is often viewed as a random listing of diverse crimes which Job vows he has never committted' (p. 427). Thus, according to Budde, it is impossible to find here 'eine strenge sachliche Gliederung' (p. 186).[1] Andersen stresses that this lack of system and structure 'effectively conveys Job's persistent indignation' (p. 239). Opposite to these observations is the opinion of the father of strophic investigation in Hebrew poetry, F.B. Köster. This scholar wonders whether the poet in ch. 31, when rounding off his composition ('beim volltönenden Schlusse'), might have intended a certain measure of irregularity. It is obvious, according to Köster, that the poem displays a 'Stufenfolge'. 'Von leichteren zu schwereren Vergehen fortgehend', the poem portrays in vv. 1–12 secret sins, in vv. 13–23 public sins, and from v. 24 onwards 'die am meisten gegen das Mosaische Gesetz verstossenden Sünden' (p. 61).[2] Schlottmann's and Ewald's main divisions are similar to the division assumed by Köster (see anal. 5.5). In vv. 1–12 Job states, according to Schlottmann, 'daß er seine böse Lust stets im Zaum gehalten', in vv. 13–23 'daß er nie seine Uebermacht ungerechter Weise gegen Schwächere gebraucht', and in vv. 24–40 'daß er nicht so, wie man ihm Schuld gab, rücksichtslos und trotzig Gott und den Menschen gegenüber gestanden habe' (p. 401). Wright also discerns three main parts, but the second disjunction in his framwework follows v. 28.

This apparently old-fashioned view on the tripartite structure of ch. 31 provides a fine starting-point for a rhetorical analysis of the poem. Especially the thematic difference between vv. 1–12 (secret sins, lust) and vv. 13 ff. (social crimes), observed by Köster and Schlottmann, must be appreciated as a fundamental dimension of this structure. From a thematic point of view the main parts, cantos, of the poem display a *linear parallelism*

---

[1] See also Dillmann and Van Selms in anal. 5.5. Using content as a criterion Dick divides the poem into vv. 1–8 (introduction), 9–32+34+38–40b (oath of clearance), 33 (conclusion of the oath), 35–37 (request for legal adjudication); see M.B. Dick, 'Job 31, The Oath of Innocence, and the Sage', *ZAW* 95 (1983), pp. 31–53 (esp. pp. 44–45).

[2] These main parts are supposed to provide a framework for a regular strophic scheme; see anal. 5.5 and note the transpositions of vv. 32 and 38–40.

(see anal. 5.2). Scholars have often observed that Job alternately makes use of *'m* clauses *with* an apodosis, in which the penalty for the failure contemplated is recorded, and *'m* clauses *without* such an apodosis. Exegetes generally explain this alternation as an indication of the 'great artistic gifts of the author' (Gordis, p. 544), who in this way avoids a monotonous repetition. It is universally overlooked, however, that the alternation is one of the main cornerstones which determines the framework of the composition. Actually, in the whole poem there are only four explicit records of punishments, vv. 8, 10, 22 and 40.[3] These records follow the *'m* clauses of vv. 7, 9, 19–21 and 38–39. All the other *'m* clauses lack an explicit imprecation; see vv. 5, 13, 16, 24–26, 29, 31, 33.[4] That is to say, the alternation between types of *'m* clauses matches the overall structure of our poem proposed by Köster (Schlottmann and Ewald). In other words each canto falls into two sections, of which the first section has not any reference to a penalty, while the second section definitely has. Because vv. 27–28 contain obvious correspondences with the end of the first canto, Wright's main division (vv. 1–12, 13–28, 29–40; see anal. 5.5) is superior to the divisions assumed by Köster, Schlottmann and Ewald; note anal. 5.2 and *lby* ('my heart'), *pth* ('to be simple'), *hw'* ('he'), *'wn plyly* ('criminal offence') in anal. 5.4.5.

The linear parallelism between the three main units of ch. 31, on the grounds of the alternation of types of *'m* clauses (described above), at the same time constitutes one of the major pillars on which its canticle division is founded. Cantos I and III divide into two identical canticles of six lines, vv. 1–6.7–12 and 29–34.35–40 resp. The second canto divides into three almost identical canticles, vv. 13–18.19–23.24–28.[5] The canticle division of canto I is strengthened by the responsions of *'yny* ('my eyes') and the preposition *mn* (anal. 5.4.4). See also *'lwh* ('God'), *'kl* ('to eat') and *šrš* (pi'el 'to uproot') in anal. 5.4.3.[6] The canticle division of canto II is strengthened by the responsions of *wl' 'kl/l' 'wkl*, *ky* and *'r'h* ('I see'); see anal. 5.4.4. See also *bṭn* ('womb'), *-ny* and *ky* in anal. 5.4.3. Canticles

---

[3] See Budde (p. 186), Weiser (p. 213), Gordis (p. 544), Habel (p. 430) and Hartley (p. 407).

[4] V. 36 does not belong with the clauses which formulate a possible crime, and therefore does not occur in our listing.

[5] For the canticle division of ch. 31 see also Ewald in anal. 5.5.

[6] There is an exegetical tradition which divides vv. 1–12 into three identical 'strophes', vv. 1–4 ('lust'), 5–8 ('dishonesty') and 9–12 ('adultery'); so Köster, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Andersen, Webster, Hartley (the descriptive phrases are Andersen's). Hartley's descriptive phrase for vv. 5–8, however, reveals that we are dealing with two themes: 'falsehood and covetousness' (so Weiser: vv. 5–6 'Falschheit', vv. 7–8 'Begehrlichkeit'; see also Epping-Nelis, p. 136). The second theme (covetousness) is identical with 'lust' (vv. 1–4). This correspondence conforms my canticle division.

II.2 and II.3 are rounded off by a reference to Job's fearing of God; see vv. 23 and 28b (and cf. also v. 15).[7] The canticle division of canto III is strengthened by the responsions of the roots *'dm* and *yṣ'* ('to go out'); see anal. 5.4.4. See also the responsio by *ptḥ* ('to open') in anal. 5.4.3 ('epiphora').

A further observation shows that the contrast between the canticles within the individual cantos is even more manifest than could be pointed out above. The first canticles in the successive cantos not only lack a formulation of penalties, but, what is more, contain positive statements about Job's righteousness; see vv. 6b, 18b, 30 and 32. So, the cantos open with an *affirmation of innocence.* This semantic parallelism between the main parts of ch. 31 constitutes the rhetorical skeleton in which Job's extensive oath of innocence is embedded. From a formal point of view the beginning of the cantos is especially marked off by *wmh*, *w-* at the beginning of the line, and *hl'*; see anal. 5.4.5.

These observations, in my opinion, corroborate Smick's view (against Andersen; cf. above) that 'there is still a goodly measure of orderly rhetoric in these passionate and explosive utterances' (p. 94). Smick takes vv. 1–4 as an introduction, and then discerns two lists of seven oaths, vv. 5–23 (first list) and vv. 24–34 (second list). Nevertheless, Smick's rhetorical analysis does not surpass the insight of former critics in discerning some order in this poem. Ch. 31 is often supposed to contain *fourteen* sins.[8] A close examination, however, reveals that there is a great variety of opinion as regards the identification of the 14 specific sins.[9] Moreover, scholars do not agree as to the number.[10] On the basis of my rhetorical analyses I think it inexpedient to look for a specific number of oaths to establish the structure of our poem.

When the length of the cantos is taken into account, the poem of ch. 31 displays a concentric pattern: 12, 16, 12 lines. The inclusio by *šdy*, *ṣ'dy* ('my steps') and the root *spr* ('to count'; see anal. 5.4.5 and cf. also Habel), which marks the first and the final canticle of the poem, enhances the symmetry of this pattern.

---

[7] When *gdlny* in v. 18a is revocalized to a pi'el (so HAL; cf. BHS), Job states in this colon that God was like a father to him. Then, the final line of canticle II.1 also matches the linear, semantic parallelism between the end of canticles II.2–3.

[8] So Hölscher, Kroeze, Gordis (p. 543), Rozelaar (p. 76 n. 1), Hartley (pp. 408–09). Gordis, Rozelaar and Hartley further emphasize that 14 represents a double heptad.

[9] According to Kroeze and Smick, e.g., the first sin is formulated in vv. 5–6, according to Gordis and Hartley in vv. 1–2, and so on.

[10] Thus, Van Selms enumerates 13 sins, Fohrer and De Wilde 12, and Ceresko 10 types of sin of which Job declares himself innocent (p. 103; similarly Lescow, pp. 176–77). Cf. also Andersen (p. 240) and Hartley (p. 408 n. 1).

Partly due to the special content of ch. 31 with its series of vows (note the *'m* clauses), we can establish that, in broad outline, the strophic structure of this poem is pretty clear. See for the demarcation of the respective strophes primarily analyses 5.2 and 5.4.2–3. The responsions in canticle I.2 constitute a fine *parallelismus stropharum* (anal. 5.4.3). See for the strophic structure of canticle II.3 also *w*- beginning line in anal. 5.3.1.1. V. 27 is generally taken as a further development of v. 26 and conceived as a reference to idolatry. The meaning of v. 27b, however, is very obscure. And v. 27a is a general reference to secret sins, reminding us of canto I. Therefore, I take v. 27 (and 28) as the apodosis of vv. 24–26 (cf. the strophic structure of canticle II.2).[11] See also *'r'h* in anal. 5.4.4.[12]

The *main thought* of the poem, I think, is formulated in the first canticles of the main units. These canticles (vv. 1–6, 13–18 and 29–34) most explicitly formulate *Job's innocence*; see especially v. 6b, 'God shall know my integrity'. On the basis of this integrity Job urges God to answer his challenge (vv. 35–37).

The poem winds up with a strophe which uses the metaphor of 'weeping furrows' (v. 38b). The use of the verb 'to weep' (*bkh*) at the end of ch. 31 forms a responsio with the final verb of the preceding poem; note *bkym* in 30,31b (see also 30,25a; cf. *'bl* in 30,31 and 29,25!). Moreover, the noun *kḥ* ('strength') in 31,39a forms an inclusio with the same noun in the first strophe of ch. 30 (30,2a and see also *klḥ* in 30,2b; but cf. *kḥ* in 30,18). These rhetorical devices disappear when vv. 38–40, as final strophe, must give way to vv. 35–37, because in these lines we find Job's ultimate challenge to God.[13] Thus, the position of vv. 38–40 at the end of ch. 31 has nothing to do with the 'absence of Western coherence' in the book of Job (so Gordis), but testifies to the well thought-out structure of the individual poems[14] and to the formal framework which determines the succession of these poems in this elaborate masterpiece of Hebrew rhetoric.

---

[11] While v. 27b does not say that the sun and the moon are being worshipped as gods, Andersen suggests that the act of kissing would have been 'a denial of God', with reference to v. 28b (p. 243).

[12] For the strophic structure of the poem as a whole see also Schlottmann, Vetter, Peters; from v. 13 onwards also Delitzsch, Ceresko, Rozelaar (anal. 5.5).

[13] This interference in MT is almost universally accepted, even with more or less orthodox critics. From this perspective I single out the names of Köster, Peters, König, Kroeze, Gordis, Rozelaar and Hartley; but see, e.g., Schlottmann, Terrien, Andersen, Ceresko, Habel. Ceresko (p. 181) aptly notes that in other poems too the climax is found before its actual end (with reference to 19,25–27 and 29,18–20).

[14] Note the responsions of *'dm* and *yṣ'* in anal. 5.4.4. Cf. also Andersen: 'The placement of the central idea away from the end (verses 35–37) so that the last lines (38–40) are not the climax, but an echo of a point made earlier in the poem, is a common device' (p. 240).

6 YHWH’s first reply to Job (1): Job 38,2–38

Structure: 2 12.12.11 > 2 4.4.4|6.6|5.6 > 2 2.2|2.2|2.2||3.3|3.3||3.2|3.3

A	[2]	*my zh mḥšyk ‘ṣh*	*bmlyn bly d‘t*
	[3]	*’zr n’ kgbr ḥlṣyk*	*w’š’lk whwdy‘ny*

I.1	[4]	*’yph hyyt bysdy ’rṣ*	*HGD ’M YD‘T bynh*
	[5]	*my śm mmdyh KY td‘*	*’w my nṭh ‘lyh qw*
	[6]	*‘l mh ’dnyh hṭb‘w*	*’w my yrh ’BN pnth*
	[7]	*brn yḥd kwkby bqr*	*wyry‘w KL BNY ’lhym*
I.2	[8]	*wysk b*DLTYM *YM*	*bgyḥw mrḥm YṢ’*
	[9]	*bśwmy ‘nn lbšw*	*w‘rpl ḥtltw*
	[10]	**w’šbr** *‘lyw ḤQy*	*w’śym bryḥ w*DLTYM
	[11]	*W’MR ‘d ph tbw’ wl’ tsyp*	*wp’ yšbt g’wn glyk*
I.3	[12]	*hmymyk ṣwyt bqr*	*yd‘th šḥr mqmw*
	[13]	*l’ḥz bknpwt h’rṣ*	*wyn‘rw* RŠ‘YM *mmnh*
	[14]	*tthpk kḥmr ḥwtm*	*wtṣb‘ kmw lbwš*
	[15]	*wymn‘ m*RŠ‘YM *’wrm*	*wzrw‘ RMH* **tšbr**

II.1	[16]	**hb’t** *‘d nbky YM*	*wbḥqr THWM hthlkt*
	[17]	*hnglw lk š‘ry mwt*	*wš‘ry ṣlmwt* **tr’h**
	[18]	*htbnnt ‘d rḥby ’rṣ*	*HGD ’M YD‘T KLh*
	[19]	*’y zh hdrk yškn ’wr*	*wḥšk ’y zh mqmw*
	[20]	*KY tqḥnw ’l gbwlw*	*wKY tbyn ntybwt bytw*
	[21]	*YD‘T KY ’z TWLD*	*wmspr ymyk rbym*
II.2	[22]	**hb’t** *’l ’ṣrwt šlg*	*w’ṣrwt brd* **tr’h**
	[23]	*’šr ḥśkty l‘t ṣr*	*lywm qrb wmlḥmh*
	[24]	*’y zh hdrk yḥlq ’wr*	*ypṣ qdym ‘ly ’rṣ*
	[25]	*my plg lšṭp t‘lh*	*wdrk lḥzyz QLWT*
	[26]	*lhmṭyr ‘l ’rṣ l’ ’yš*	*mdbr l’ ’dm bw*
	[27]	*lhśby‘ š’h wmš’h*	*wlhṣmyḥ mṣyh dš’*

III.1 [28] *hyš lmṭr ’b*   *’w my HWLYD ’gly ṭl*
[29] *mbṭn my YṢ’ hqrḥ*   *wkpr šmym my YLDW*
[30] *k’BN* **mym** *ytḥb’w*   *wpny THWM ytlkdw*

[31] *htqšr m‘dnwt kymh*   *’w mškwt ksyl tptḥ*
[32] *hTṢY’ mzrwt b‘tw*   *w‘yš ‘l BNYh tnḥm*

III.2 [33] *hyd‘t ḤQWT šmym*   *’m tśym mšṭrw b’rṣ*
[34] *hTRYM l‘b QWLk*   *wšp‘t* **mym** *tksk*
[35] *htšlḥ brqym wylkw*   *WY’MRW lk hnnw*

[36] *my št bṭḥwt ḥkmh*   *’w my ntn lśkwy bynh*
[37] *my yspr šḥqym bḥkmh*   *wnbly šmym my yškyb*
[38] *bṣqt ‘pr lmwṣq*   *wrgbym ydbqw*

6.1 Text

V. 11b—*yšbt g’wn*: ‘must stop the height’; so Bickell, Budde, Fohrer, Gordis, De Wilde, Van Selms. MT *yšyt bg’wn*.

V. 14b—*wtṣb‘*: ‘and it is dyed/colored’; so Budde, Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Pope, De Wilde, Van Selms, Rozelaar (cf. also Fohrer). MT *wytyṣbw* (‘and they stand’).

V. 24a—*’wr*: ‘lightning’; see for this meaning Job 36,30.32 37,3.11.15 and anal. 6.4.5 (so also Van Selms and Habel; cf. Andersen).

V. 27b—*mṣyh*: ‘from the dry ground’ (cf. Job 30,3); so Beer, Dhorme, Fohrer, Hartley (cf. Gordis and De Wilde). MT *mṣ’* (‘source’).

V. 36a—*ṭḥwt*: ‘ibis’; so Dhorme, Fohrer, Gordis, Keel (1978, p. 60 n. 219), HAL, Hartley.

V. 36b—*śkwy*: ‘cock’; see especially O. Keel, *VT* 31 (1981), pp. 220–23 (so also Dhorme, Fohrer, Gordis, HAL, Hartley).

6.2 Content

God, the creator of a salutary design in the inanimate physical world.

A Introduction: I would like you to give me a clear answer to the following questions (vv. 2–3).

I The fundamental structure of the world.
  I.1 Where were you when I constructed the *earth*? (vv. 4–7).
  I.2 I set the boundaries to the *sea* (vv. 8–11).
  I.3 Have you ever commanded the *morning to put an end to the power of the wicked*? (vv. 12–15).

II The origins of chaos and orderly design.
- II.1 About chaos forces and creation.
  - What do you know of the inmost recesses of the chaos waters and death? (vv. 16–18).
  - What do you know of the recesses of light and darkness? (vv. 19–21).
- II.2 About chaos forces and creation.
  - What do you know of the recesses of the destructive natural phenomena? (vv. 22–24).
  - I look after the torrents and the thunderstorms *to make the barren land fit for habitation.* (vv. 25–27).

III God's administration of the firmament.
- III.1 God's administration of the regions far-away.
  - I am the creator of dew and ice (vv. 28–30).
  - Can you in any way influence the constellations? (vv. 31–32).
- III.2 God's beneficial administration of the earthly regions.
  - Can you influence the firmament and order rain and lightning? (vv. 33–35; cf. vv. 31–32).
  - In my wisdom I provide *genial showers* (vv. 36–38; cf. vv. 25–27).

6.3 Transition markers

6.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

6.3.1.1 *my*, v. 2a
'yph, v. 4a
imperative: *hgd*, v. 4b
mh, v. 6a
my, v. 6b
w- beginning line, v. 8a
w- beginning line, v. 10a; ext. // *w-* in v. 11a
h- interr., v. 12a
h- interr., v. 16a; ext. // *h-* interr. in v. 17a
'y, v. 19a
'y, v. 19b
h- interr., v. 22a
my, v. 25a
h- interr., v. 28a
my, v. 28a; ext. // *my* in vv. 29a and b
h- interr., v. 31a; ext. // *h-* interr. in v. 32a
h- interr., v. 33a; ext. // *h-* interr. in vv. 34a and 35a
my, v. 36a; ext. // *my* in v. 37a
my, v. 36b; ext. // *my* in v. 37b

6.3.1.2 *zh*, v. 2a
zh, v. 19a
zh, v. 19b

6.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

6.3.2.1 *'mr*, v. 11a
rš', v. 13b
rš', v. 15a
zh, v. 24a
'mr, v. 35a

6.3.2.2 imperative: *'zr*, v. 3a
n', v. 3a
imperative: *whwdy'ny*, v. 3b
w- beginning line, v. 15a
imperative: *hgd*, v. 18b
'z, v. 21a
'y, v. 24a
hnh, v. 35b

6.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

my, v. 5a and 5b

6.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

6.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

': *'bn*, vv. 6, 30; *'w*, vv. 5, 6, 28, 31, 36; *'wr*, vv. 15, 19, 24; *'y*, vv. 19, 19, 24; *'l* (prep.), vv. 20, 22; *'m*, vv. 4, 18, 33; *'mr*, vv. 11, 35; *'ṣr*, vv. 22, 22; *'rṣ*, vv. 4, 13, 18, 24, 26, 33
b: *b-*, vv. 2, 4, 7, 8, 8, 9, 13, 16, 26, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38; *bw'*, vv. 11, 16, 22; *byn*, vv. 4, 18, 20, 36; *bn*, vv. 7, 32; *bqr*, vv. 7, 12
d: *dlt*, vv. 8, 10; *drk*, vv. 19, 24, 25
h: *h-* (article), vv. 13, 19, 24, 29; *h-* interr., vv. 12, 16, 17, 22, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35; *-h*, vv. 5, 5, 6, 6, 13, 18, 32; *hlk*, vv. 16, 35
w: *-w*, vv. 8, 9, 9, 10, 12, 19, 20, 20, 26, 29, 32, 33
z: *zh*, vv. 2, 19, 19, 24
ḥ: *ḥkmh*, vv. 36, 37; *ḥqq*, vv. 10, 33; *ḥšk*, vv. 2, 19
y: *-y*, vv. 4, 9, 10; *yd'*, vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 18, 21, 33; *ywm*, vv. 12, 21, 23; *yld*, vv. 21, 28, 29; *ym*, vv. 8, 16; *yṣ'*, vv. 8, 29, 32
k: *k-*, vv. 3, 14, 14, 30; *-k*, vv. 3, 3, 11, 17, 21, 34, 34, 35; *ky*, vv. 5, 20, 20, 21; *kl*, vv. 7, 18
l: *l-*, vv. 13, 17, 23, 23, 25, 25, 26, 27, 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 38; *l'*, vv. 11, 26, 26; *lbš*, vv. 9, 14
m: *mṭr*, vv. 26, 28; *my*, vv. 2, 5, 5, 6, 25, 28, 29, 29, 36, 36, 37, 37; *mym*, vv. 30, 34; *mn*, vv. 8, 12, 13, 15, 27*, 29
n: *ngd*, vv. 4, 18
s: *spr*, vv. 21, 37
': *'d*, vv. 11, 16, 18; *'l*, vv. 5, 6, 10, 24 (*'ly*), 26, 32
p: *pnh* ('corner')/*pnh* ('to turn'), vv. 6 and 30 resp.

q: *qwl*, vv. 25, 34; *qwm*, vv. 12, 19
r: *r'h*, vv. 17, 22; *rwm*, vv. 15, 34; *rš'*, vv. 13, 15
ś: *śym*, vv. 5, 9, 10, 33
š: *š'h*, vv. 27, 27; *šbr*, vv. 10, 15; *šmym*, vv. 29, 33, 37; *š'r*, vv. 17, 17
t: *thwm*, vv. 16, 30

6.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *yd'*, vv. 2b.3b—linear
vv. 4–5: *yd'*, vv. 4b.5a
vv. 10–11: *w'šbr/w'mr*, vv. 10a and 11a resp.–linear
vv. 12–13: *mn*, vv. 12a.13b
vv. 16–18: *h-* interr., vv. 16a.17a—exactly linear
'd, vv. 16a.18a—inclusio
vv. 19–21: *drk/ntyb*, vv. 19a and 20b resp.
ky, vv. 20a+b.21a
vv. 22–24: *'ṣrwt/ṣr/'rṣ*, vv. 22a+b, 23a and 24b resp.—alliteration
vv. 25–27: *l-*, vv. 25a+b.26a.27a+b
vv. 28–30: *my*, vv. 28b.29a+b
yld, vv. 28b.29b
vv. 31–32: *h-* interr., vv. 31a.32a—exactly linear
vv. 33–35: *h-* interr., vv. 33a.34a.35a—exactly linear
-k, vv. 34a+b.35b
qwlk/wylkw, vv. 34a and 35a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
vv. 36–38: *my*, vv. 36a.37a—exactly linear; see also *my* in v. 36b and 37b
ḥkmh, vv. 36a.37a!—linear
šḥq/'pr, vv. 37a and 38a resp.; cf. Isa. 40,12+15 Ps. 78,23+27 Prov. 8,26+28

6.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 4–7 (I.1): *b-* + infinit. constr., vv. 4a.7a—inclusio (Jamieson-Drake, pp. 220–21)
'w my, vv. 5b.6b—concatenatio; see also *my* in v. 5a
'l, vv. 5b.6a—concatenatio
vv. 8–11 (I.2): *dltym*, vv. 8a.10b!—linear
śym, vv. 9a.10b—concatenatio
vv. 12–15 (I.3): *wyn'rw/wymn'*, vv. 13b and 15a resp. (allit.)—linear
rš'ym, vv. 13b.15a!—linear
mn, vv. 12a+13b.15a

vv. 16–21 (II.1): *byn*, vv. 18a.20b
yd‘t, vv. 18b.21a—linear
vv. 22–27 (II.2): *drk*, vv. 24a.25b—concatenatio
‘ly/‘l ’rṣ, vv. 24b.26a
vv. 28–32 (III.1): *h-* interr., vv. 28a.31a+32a—exactly linear
’w, vv. 28b.31b—exactly linear
yṣ’, vv. 29a.32a
vv. 33–38 (III.2): *yd‘/byn*, vv. 33a and 36b resp.—linear (cf. v. 4b)
šmym in vv. 33a.37b

6.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 4–15 (canto I): *’yph/ph(/p’)*, vv. 4a and 11a(+b) resp.
-y, vv. 4a.9a+10a!
’rṣ, vv. 4a.13a—linear } chiasm
yd‘, vv. 4b+5a.12b—linear
śym, vv. 5a.9a+10b
bqr, vv. 7a.12a! (end colon)
lbš, vv. 9a.14b!
šbr, vv. 10a.15b!—linear
’mr/ṣwh, vv. 11a and 12a resp.—concatenatio

vv. 16–27 (canto II): *hb’t*, vv. 16a.22a!—exactly linear
tr’h, vv. 17b.22b!—linear
’y zh hdrk ... ’wr, vv. 19a.24a!—symmetric; see also *’y zh* in v. 19b!, and *drk* in v. 25b!
ḥšk/ḥśk, vv. 19b and 23a resp.—‘symmetric’
’l (prep.), vv. 20a.22a!—‘symmetric’

vv. 28–38 (canto III): *lmṭr ’b/htrym l‘b*, vv. 28a and 34a resp. (alliter.)—linear
’w my, vv. 28b.36b; see also *my* in vv. 29, 36a, 37
šmym,vv. 29b.33a+37b!
mym, vv. 30a.34b!—linear
h- interr., vv. 31a+32a.33a+34a+35a—concat.; see also v. 28a
kymh/ḥkmh, vv. 31a and 36a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
’w mškwt ksyl/’w my ... lśkwy, vv. 31b and 36b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear

6.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–3.19–24:	*zh*, vv. 2a.19a+b+24a!
	ḥšk, vv. 2a.19b!
vv. 4–7.28–38, ‘inclusio’:	*bynh* (last word of the line), vv. 4b.36b; see also *ḥkmh* in vv. 36a and 37a (Vetter, p. 54)
	’w my, vv. 5b+6b.28b+36b!; see also *’w* in v. 31b!
vv. 4–9.16–21.28–32:	*hgd ’m yd‘t*, vv. 4b.18b!—linear; see also *’rṣ* (in vv. 4a and 18a) and *byn* (in vv. 4b and 18a), furthermore *yd‘t* in v. 21a
	byn, vv. 4b.18a+20b
	ky, vv. 5a.20a+b+21a!
	’bn, vv. 6b.30a!
	pnh/pnh, vv. 6b and 30b resp.!—alliteration
	kl, vv. 7b.18b!
	bnym, vv. 7b.32b!
	ym, vv. 8a.16a!
	mrḥm yṣ’/mbṭn … yṣ’, vv. 8b and 29a resp.!; see also *yṣ’* in v. 32a!
	thwm, vv. 16b.30b!—linear
	hthlkt/ytlkdw, vv. 16b and 30b resp.—alliter.
	yld, vv. 21a.28b+29b!
vv. 10–15.22–27.33–38:	*ḥqq*, vv. 10a.33a!
	’mr, vv. 11a.35b!
	bw’, vv. 11a.22a
	l’, vv. 11a.26a+b!
	ṣwh/šlḥ, vv. 12a and 35a resp. (messenger metaphor; Habel)
	l- beginning line, vv. 13.26+27!
	rwm, vv. 15b.34a!
	’wr/brq, vv. 24a and 35a resp.—linear; cf. anal. 6.1
	qwl, vv. 25b.34a!
vv. 2–3.4–5, concat.:	*my*, vv. 2a.5a+b
	yd‘, vv. 2b+3b.4b+5a
vv. 12–15.16–21, concat.:	*h-* interr., vv. 12a.16a+17a

ymyk, vv. 12a.21b! } chiasm
yd‘t(h), vv. 12b.21a
mqmw, vv. 12b.19b!
’wr, vv. 15a.19a (end colon)

vv. 25–27.28–30, concat.: *my*, vv. 25a.28–29
l-, vv. 25–27.28a
mṭr, vv. 26a.28a!
mn, vv. 27b*.29a

6.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

6.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
’m (v. 33), *’rṣ*, *b-*, *h-* (article), *-w*, *ywm* (v. 23), *-k*, *l-*, *‘d* (v. 11), *‘l*, *śym* (v. 33)

6.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*’ṣr*), *-h*, *hlk*, *k-*, *spr*, (*š’h*), (*š‘r*)

6.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–3|4–7.8–11.12–15|16–18.19–21.22–24|25–27.28–30.31–32. 33–35.36–38 (2|4.4.4|3.3.3|3.3.2.3.3)
Stickel (1842): 2–3|4–7.8–11|12–15.16–21.22–27.28–30.31–35.36–38|... (2|4.4|4.6.6.3.5.3|...)
Schlottmann (1851): 2–3.4–7.8–11.12–15|16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30| 31–32.33–35.36–38 (2.4.4.4|5×3|2.3.3)
Ewald (1854): 2–3.4–15.16–27.28–38*... (2.12.12.12...)
Merx (1871): 2–3|4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30.31–33. 34–36.37–38*|... (4|3×8.8×6|...)
Hitzig (1874): 2–3 4–11.12–15.16–21.22–23.24–27.28–30.31–35.36–38||... (2 8.4.6.2.4.3.5.3||...)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–3.4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30. 31–33.34–38... (4.8.8.8.6×6.10...); cf. RSV (1952)
Wright (1883): 2–3.4–7.8–11|12–15.16–18.19–21|22–24.25–27.28–30|31–32. 33–36.37–38|... (4.8.8|8.6.6|6.6.6|4.8.4|...)
Dillmann (1891): 2–3 4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30. 31–33.34–35.36–38|... (4 8.8.8.6×6.4.6|...); similarly Keel (1978), pp. 53–61
Ley (1895): 2–3.4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30.31–33. 34–36.37–38 (2.4.4.4.7×3.2); cf. Merx (1871)

Duhm (1897): 2–3|4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11|12–15*.19–20.16–17.18+21|22–23.24–25.26–27.29–30|31–32.33–34.35–36.37–38

Vetter (1897): 2–3 4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18|19 21.22–23.24–27.28–30.31–32.33–35.36–38||...

Hontheim (1904): 2–7.31–32+12–15|8–11|16–21.22–27|28 30|33–35.36–38 (6.6|4|6.6|3|3.3)

Schlögl (1916): 2–3|4–15.16–27.28–35 (24.24.16)

Löhr (1918): 4–11|12+13a+14a+19–20+16–18+21|22–23+29–30+24–27|31–38 (4×8)

Peters (1928): 2–3|4–5.6–7|8–9.10–11|12–13.14–15|16–17.18–19|20–21.22–23|24–25.26–27|28–30.31–33|34–35.36–38 (2|2.2|2.2|2.2|2.2|2.2|2.2|3.3|2.3)

König (1929): 2–3|4–11.12–15.16–18.19–21.22–30.31–35.36–38|...

Kissane (1939): 2–3+31–32.4–7.8–11.12–15; 16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30.33–35.36–38 (4×4; 7×3)

Möller (1955): 2–3.4–15.16–21.22–33.34–41... (2.12.6.12.8...)

Fohrer (1963): 2–3 4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18+21|22–25.26–27+29–30.31–34.35–38||... (2 4.4.4.4|4.4.4.4||...)

Terrien (1963): 2–3.4–7|8–11.16–18|19–21.12–15|22–24.25–28|31–33.34–38

Skehan (1964): 2–3|4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18.19–21.22–24.25–27.28–30.31–33.34–35+37–38||... (2|4.4.4.6×3.4||...); cf. NAB (1970)

TOB (1978): 2–3.4–7|8–11.12–15.16–18|19–21.22–26.27–30|31–38|...

De Wilde (1981): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18+21|19–20.22–23.29–30.24–25.26–27.31–32.33–34.35–36.37–38|...

Van Selms (1983): 2–11.12–15.16–21.22–30.31–38...

Rozelaar (1984): 2–3.4–7.8–11.12–15.16–18.19–21.22–30.31–38...

Webster (1984), p. 98: 2–3|4–7.8–11.12–15; 16–18.19–23.24–27.28–30.31–35.36–38

Habel (1985): 2–3 4–7.8–11|12–15.16–18.19–21|22–30.31–33.34–38||...

Bezuidenhout (1986): 2–3||4–7.8–11.12–15|16–18.19–21||22–24.25–27.28–30|31–35.36–38||...

Jamieson-Drake (1987), pp. 220–24.232–33: 2–3.4–7.8–11|12–15.16–19.20–21||22–23.24.25–27.28.29–30|31–35.36–38 (2.4.4|4.4.2||2.1.3.1.2|5.3)

Hartley (1988): 2–3 4–7.8–11.12–15|16–18.19–21.22–24||25–38|...

6.6 Comments and summary

Chs. 38–39 contain God's first extensive reaction to Job's repeated challenge to prove his guilt. The first part of this speech deals with the physical inanimate world (38,2–38), and its second part with the animal and bird kingdoms (38,39–39,30). It is almost generally agreed that this thematic difference divides God's first reply into two poems; see anal. 6.5.[1] I will make an attempt to prove that each of these poems has a rhetorical coherence all its own.

The poetic framework of the beginning of ch. 38 is unequivocal. The poem opens with an introductory strophe of two lines (vv. 2–3), in which God reproaches Job for his unwise words and summons him to answer his questions.[2] This introductory strophe is followed by three identical units of four lines, vv. 4–7, 8–11, 12–15.[3] These four-line units deal with different aspects of creation. The last noun of the first colon, each time records the subject of the unit in question, *'rṣ* ('earth', v. 4a), *ym* ('sea', v. 8a), *bqr* ('morning', v. 12a).[4]

From v. 16 onwards the pattern of the four-line units is abandoned (against Fohrer), apparently to make place for a pattern of primarily three-line strophes. However, before we can establish the formal skeleton of the poem on the level of the strophes, we must discuss the overall structure of 38,2–38. Analysis 6.5 makes it clear that critics widely differ as to this level of the rhetorical framework of our composition. Nevertheless, there is some consensus on the opinion that the first main break comes after the introductory strophe, vv. 1–2.[5] Some scholars, then, take the three 4-line units, dealing with the construction of the world (vv. 4–15), as a first main section.[6] Others, however, see a main break after vv. 11 and 21,[7] or after v. 18.[8] Recently Jamieson-Drake has offered a rhetorical analysis of 38,2–38. On the basis of this analysis it is concluded that the poem consists of two main sections, with a caesura between vv. 21 and 22.[9] These sections, according to Jamieson-Drake, are marked by 'refrain lines' that indicate their themes. The refrain lines of vv. 4 and 18 are supposed to indicate that ‘earth’ is the theme of the first section (vv. 2–21). The second section is supposed to deal with ‘heaven’, a theme indicated by the refrain lines of vv. 29 and 37. Jamieson-Drake further makes the assumption that the literary structure of the poem is based on the careful ‘positioning of the refrain lines, of interrogatives, and of *a small number of key words*’ (p. 220; italics are mine, PvdL). So, there is a great variety of opinion about the question whether the poem displays two, three or more main units, and where we must position the caesuras between the main units. Fortunately, this variety of opinion is partly due to the fact that scholars mostly overlook the several layers (of the strophes, the canticles and the cantos) which determine the rhetorical structure of a Hebrew poem. That is to say, the diverse views about the overall structure of this poem do not always contradict each other, but are often complementary.

---

[1] Recently, however, Hartley has advocated the view that the speech falls into two sections after 38,24. According to this division, the first section (38,2–24) deals with the structure of the world, and the second section (38,25–39,30) with the maintenance of the world.

[2] For the special character of this strophe see part VI, 1.2.6.

[3] Cf. for vv. 12–15 I. Cornelius, 'The Sun Epiphany in Job 38,12–15 and the Iconography of the Gods in the Ancient Near East—The Palestinian Connection', *JNSL* 16 (1990), pp. 25–43.

[4] Critics generally agree about the demarcation of these four-line units; see anal. 6.5.

[5] See Köster, Stickel, Ewald, Merx, Dillmann, Duhm, Vetter, Schlögl, König, Möller, Fohrer, Skehan, Webster, Habel, Hartley in anal. 6.5.

[6] So Köster, Ewald, Schlögl, Möller, Webster and Hartley; cf. also Schlottmann and Kissane in anal. 6.5.

[7] So Wright, Duhm, Löhr, Van Selms, Habel; cf. also Stickel and Möller in anal. 6.5.

[8] See Vetter and TOB in anal. 6.5.

[9] Cf. Fohrer and De Wilde in anal. 6.5.

In my opinion, the rhetorical analysis of 38,2–38 makes it perfectly clear that the main body of this poem shows a tripartite framework, consisting of three almost identical cantos, vv. 4–15, 16–27, 28–38 (see Ewald and Schlögl in anal. 6.5!). As we will see below each of these cantos has a relatively individual theme all its own. However, from a thematic point of view the most obvious rhetorical phenomenon is constituted by the repeated idea of the functional aspect of creation which rounds off the cantos. Each of the cantos, namely, winds up with some lines which relate the cosmic dimensions of God’s creation to the *beneficial effect* this achievement has *for the human domain*; cf. anal. 6.2. God’s creation of the morning puts an end to the dominion of the wicked on earth (vv. 12–15); note *rš‘* in vv. 13 and 15.[10] In vv. 25–27 we read about the showers God pours out on the barren land. Although no one dwells in that place, the appositions *l’ ’yš* (‘no one’) and *l’ ’dm* (‘no man’) in v. 26 indicate that we are dealing with the human world. In vv. 33–38, finally, the heavenly rain is explicitly related to man (Job; see v. 34b) and earth (v. 38). In vv. 12–15 and 25–27 this purpose of creation is marked by clauses which open with the preposition *l-* followed by a verb in the infinit. constr.; see *l’ḥz* (‘to seize’) in v. 13, and *lhmṭyr* (‘to rain’), *lhśby‘* (‘to saturate’), *lhṣmyḥ* (‘to sprout forth’) in vv. 26–27. This construction does not occur elsewhere in the poem. The unique character of the lines concerned in the context of 38,2–38 is a major pillar on which the overall structure of our poem is founded.[11] This thematic observation coincides with the outcome of an analysis of the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as a whole. This analysis reveals that the beginning of the cantos is clearly marked off by a cluster of responsions; note especially *hgd 'm yd't* ('tell if you know'),[12] *'bn* ('stone'), *kl*, *thwm* ('the Deep'), *yld* ('to give birth') in anal. 6.4.5. See for the responsions which demarcate the end of the cantos especially *l-* at the beginning of the line, *rwm* ('to be high') and *qwl* ('voice') in anal. 6.4.5. A study of the internal structures of the cantos themselves confirms these findings.

---

[10] G.R. Driver has interpreted *rš‘* as ‘Dog-star’ and *zrw‘ rmh* (v. 15b) as ‘the Navigator’s Line’; *JTS* 4 (1953), pp. 208–12 (so also NEB). This interpretation, however, is not convincing (Gordis). Moreover, the rhetorical structure of the poem militates against the elimination of all references to human beings from the passage; against Jamieson-Drake, pp. 226–27. Vv. 12–15 ‘speak directly to Job’s concern that the wicked prosper unchecked’ (Hartley, p. 497; see also Habel, p. 540).

The second canto divides into two identical canticles of six lines, vv. 16–21 and 22–27. From a formal point of view this division is indicated by the responsio of *hb't* ('have you entered?') at the very beginning of the canticles (vv. 16 and 22; 'anaphora'); see also *tr'h* ('have you seen?') in anal. 6.4.4.[13] From a thematic point of view the canticle division is reinforced by a linear, semantic parallelism between canticles II.1 and II.2 in their entirety. The first three lines of these units (vv. 16–18 and 22–24) deal with Job's understanding of the forces of chaos and destruction; note especially *thwm* ('the Deep') and *mwt* ('death') in v. 16–17,[14] and *ṣr* ('distress'), *qrb* ('war') and *mlḥmh* ('battle') in v. 23. Contrary to these lines, the last three lines of these units (vv. 19–21 and 25–27) refer to God's creative deeds; note the distinction between 'light' and 'darkness' in v. 19, and the life-giving rains described in vv. 25–27.[15] This alternation of motifs (chaos and creation; pattern: a.b|a'.b') is of fundamental importance, not only for the determination of the canticle structure of canto II, but also for the thematic demarcation of the successive cantos and for the strophic structure of canto II (see below).

Canto III also falls into two canticles, vv. 28–32 and 33–38. The second canticle distinguishes itself from the preceding one because canticle III.2

---

[11] Cf. H. Rowold, 'Yahweh's Challenge to Rival: The Form and Function of the Yahweh-Speech in Job 38–39', *CBQ* 47 (1985), pp. 199–211 (esp. pp. 203 and 211). Rowold rightly notes, in my opinion, that the lines in question 'far from being parenthetic or distracting statements, ... are integral and vital to Yahweh's self-revelation' in this chapter, because they relate God's purpose to the 'well-being of the world' (p. 203; Rowold also mentions the joy of the stars [v. 7] in this context). See about the 'functional or teleological aspects' of God's design for the universe also Habel (p. 533).

[12] Vetter (pp. 53–54) and Jamieson-Drake (p. 220) take this repetition as a device of inclusio, which demarcates the first main part of the poem (vv. 4–18 and 2–21 resp.).

[13] It must be conceded, however, that this analysis does not unequivocally support the division into vv. 16–21 and 22–27.

[14] See in this context also *ym* in v. 16a, *ṣlmwt* in v. 17b and *'rṣ* in v. 18a.

[15] About 'der Kultur schaffende Charakter' of vv. 25–27 see Keel (1978, p. 58). With regard to vv. 22–30 Jamieson-Drake correctly observes that we are dealing with two different aspects of weather, 'the destructive and the benign aspects' (p. 223).

calls attention to the domain of man (note *'rṣ* in v. 33b, and *ṯḥwt* and *śkwy* in v. 36), whereas III.1 deals with regions far-away (note *thwm* in v. 30 and the mention of several constellations in vv. 31–32); cf. anal. 6.2. From a formal perspective it is remarkable that the dividing line between vv. 32 and 33 should clearly be indicated by the pattern of verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as a whole; note *bnym* ('sons'), *yṣ'* ('to go out') and *ḥqq* ('to engrave') in anal. 6.4.5.[16] See also *mym* ('water') and the alliterations in anal. 6.4.4. The three four-line units in vv. 4–15, described above, constitute the canticle division of canto I, vv. 4–7, 8–11 and 12–15. See also *dltym* ('doors') and *rš'ym* ('wicked') in anal. 6.4.3, and *šbr* ('to break') in anal. 6.4.4. It must be conceded, however, that the analysis of the verbal repetitions does not contribute a great deal to the determination of these units. It is possible now, to establish with some certainty the thematic individuality of the successive cantos.

The first canto (vv. 4–15) deals with God's creative deeds in general, with the fundamental structure of the world. The canto is dominated by verbs which express the idea of construction; see *śym* ('to put') in vv. 5a.9a.10b, *nṭh* ('to stretch out') in v. 5b, *ṭb'* (hoph'al 'to be sunk') in v. 6a, *yrh* ('to lay') in v. 6b, *skk* ('to block') in v. 8a, *šbr* ('to break') in vv. 10a.15b.[17] Canto II (vv. 16–27) thematically distinguishes itself from the preceding one, because it structurally refers to the contrast between chaos and creation (see above). In this canto we especially meet roots that are somehow related to the notion of understanding; see *bw'* ('to come') in vv. 16a.22a, *hlk* ('to walk') in v. 16b, *glh* ('to disclose') in v. 17a, *r'h* ('to see') in vv. 17a.22b, *byn* ('to understand') in vv. 18a.20b, *yd'* ('to know') in vv. 18b.21a, *drk* ('to tread') in vv. 19a.24a.25b (see also *ntyb* ['path'] in v. 20b).[18] At the end of canto II we again meet a verb that expresses construction, reminding us of canto I; see *plg* (pi'el 'to cleave') in v. 25a. The noun *drk* ('path') indicates that vv. 25–27 belong with canto II; see anal. 6.4.4 and cf. above. From a formal point of view canto II obviously ties in with canto I by the device of concatenatio; see *ymyk* and *mqmw* in anal. 6.4.5. Canto III, finally, deals with the notion of God's administration of the firmament; note *šmym* in vv. 29, 33 and 37.[19] The transition from canto

---

[16] These observations speak against the (modern) view that v. 33 belongs with the preceding lines about the constellations; cf. anal. 6.5.

[17] The successive, four-line canticles are further held together by the noun *bqr* ('mourning'), and the roots *lbš* ('to dress') and *šbr* ('to break'); see anal. 6.4.4.

[18] Keel observes that in vv. 8–11 and 12–15 the images of the 'Chaoskämpfer' are opposed to the darkening of God's *'ṣh*, whereas the following strophes emphasize 'die fehlende Sachkenntnis Ijobs' (1978, p. 56). The notion of understanding, however, is not lacking altogether in canto I; see *yd'* in vv. 4b, 5a and 12b, and *byn* in v. 4b.

[19] Ewald describes the thematic difference between cantos II and III as follows: 'so

II to canto III is again marked by the device of concatenatio; see especially *mṭr* (hiph'il 'to send rain') in anal. 6.4.5. Within this tripartite structure the first canticle of canto III (note vv. 31–32 about the constellations) constitute an obvious semantic responsio to the first canticle of canto I (note v. 7a about the singing stars).[20]

The strophic structure of canto II is for the most part thematically determined; note the alternation of the chaos and creation motif described above (cf. anal. 6.2). These motifs divide the canto into an uninterrupted sequence of three-line strophes, vv. 16–18, 19–21, 22–24, 25–27.[21] See furthermore analyses 6.3.1.1 and 6.4.2. The verbal repetitions described in anal. 6.4.3, however, do not contribute to this division. See for the strophic structure of canto III especially analyses 6.2, 6.3.1.1 and 6.4.2. In the first strophe of canticle III.1 (vv. 28–30) the interrogative clauses make use of the pronoun *my* ('who') and do not directly address Job himself. The same is true for the final strophe of canticle III.2 (vv. 36–38). The second strophe of canticle III.1 (vv. 31–32) and the first strophe of canticle III.2 (vv. 33–35) distinguish themselves from the former, because the interrogative clauses explicitly address Job; note *htqšr* ('can you bind?') in v. 31a etc. From this point of view canto III displays an a.b|b'.a' pattern.[22] We may assume that the four-line canticles of canto I all divide into two strophes of two lines. However, from a thematic point of view this cannot univocally be established. From a formal perspective this is indicated by analyses 6.3.1.1, 6.4.2, and by *dltym* and *rš'ym* in anal. 6.4.3.[23]

On the basis of this rhetorical analysis, I conclude that the final units of the cantos (vv. 12–15, 25–27 and 33–38) express the *quintessential thought* of the poem. These strophes explicitly state that God's creation of the universe has a *beneficial influence in the human domain.* Creation puts an end to the secret practices of the wicked on earth (v. 15)[24] and changes its surface, be it inhabited by man or not, into fertile soil (vv. 27 and 37–38).

---

sind es ... von der einen Seite geheime Oerter und Wege 38,16–27, von der andern v. 28–38 seltsame Wandelungen und Wechsel in denen sich ihr wunderbares den Menschen auf eine über ihm stehende göttliche Weisheit hinweisendes Wesen vorzüglich offenbart' (p. 297).

[20] Cf. the relocation of vv. 31–32 by Hontheim (and Kissane) in anal. 6.5.

[21] So also Köster, Schlottmann, Merx, Wright, Dillmann, Ley, Kissane, Skehan and Keel (pp. 56–57).

[22] About vv. 31–35 see also Jamieson-Drake, p. 223. On the level of the poem as a whole this nuance enhances the device of concatenatio between the cantos, described above. Vv. 5–11 are governed by the interrogative pronoun *my* (*w-* in v. 8a refers to *my* in v. 5). From v. 12 onwards the lines are governed by questions which explicitly address Job (cf. v. 4). Vv. 25–30, finally, are again dominated by the interrogative pronoun *my*.

[23] For these two-line strophes see also Duhm, Peters and De Wilde in anal. 6.5.

[24] Cf. *wzrw' rmh tšbr* in 38,15b with *w'zr'y mqnh tšbr* in 31,22b.

Rowold rightly concludes on the basis of the 'purpose/result' clauses which are found in this chapter that God 'moves beyond Job's submission' and aims at 'restoration of a proper relationship'.[25] This outcome is diametrically opposed to that of Jamieson-Drake's literary approach. According to this critic 'there is a complete absence of God's care for people in the creation passages of the Yahweh speeches' (p. 226). Ch. 38 is supposed only to emphasize God's sovereignty (p. 224).

---

[25] Rowold, *art. cit.*, p. 211. Cf. also M.V. Fox, 'Job 38 and God's Rhetoric', *Semeia* 19 (1981), pp. 53–61. Fox concludes: 'God is pointing to the infinity of his own wisdom and to the limitation of Job's. But the limitation of Job's wisdom is not the main point.' According to Fox, God's rule over the cosmos includes justice in the human sphere (with reference to 38,13.15 and 40,11–13).

7 YHWH’s first reply to Job (2): Job 38,39–39,30

Structure: 15.13.5 > 7.8|6.7|5 > 3.4|4.4||6|7||5 > 3|2.2||2.2|2.2|||3.3|| 2.3.2|||3.2

I.1.1	[39] *hTṢWD llby’ ṭrp*	*WḤYT kpyrym tml’*	
	[40] *ky yšḥw bm‘wnwt*	*yšbw bskh lmw ’RB*	
	[41] **my** *ykyn l‘rb ṢYDw*	*ky yldw ’l ’l yšw‘w*	*yt‘w lbly ’KL*
I.1.2	[1] *hyd‘t ‘T ldt y‘ly SL‘*	*ḥll ’ylwt tšmr*	
	[2] *tspr yrḥym tml’nh*	*wyd‘t ‘T ldtnh*	
	[3] *tkr‘nh yldyhn tplḥnh*	*ḥblyhm tšlḥnh*	
	[4] *yḥlmw BNYhm* **yrbw** *bbr*	*yṣ’w wl’* **šbw** *lmw*	
I.2.1	[5] **my** *šlḥ pr’ ḥpšy*	*wmsrwt ‘rwd* **my** *ptḥ*	
	[6] *’šr śmty ‘rbh bytw*	*wmšknwtyw mlḥh*	
	[7] *yśḥq lhmwn qryh*	*tš’wt nwgš l’ yšm‘*	
	[8] *ytwr hrym mr‘hw*	*w’ḥr kl yrwq ydrwš*	
I.2.2	[9] *hy’bh rym ‘bdk*	*’m ylyn ‘l ’bwsk*	
	[10] *htqšr rym btlm ‘btw*	*’m yśdd ‘MQYM ’ḥryk*	
	[11] *htbṭḥ bw ky* **rb** *KḤw*	*wt‘zb ’lyw ygy‘k*	
	[12] *hT’MYN bw ky* **yšyb** *zr‘k*	*wgrnk y’sp*	

II.1	[13] *KNP rnnym n‘lsh*	*’m ’BRh ḥsydh wNṢh*
	[14] *ky t‘zb l’rṣ bṣyh*	*w‘l ‘pr tḥmm*
	[15] *wtškḥ ky rgl tzwrh*	*WḤYT hśdh tdwšh*
	[16] *hqšyḥ BNYh ll’ lh*	*lryq ygy‘h bly pḥd*
	[17] *ky hšh ’lwh ḥkmh*	*wl’ ḥlq lh bBYNH*
	[18] *k‘T bMRWM tmry’*	*tśḥq lsws wlrkbw*
II.2	[19] *httn lsws gbwrh*	*htlbyš ṣw’rw r‘mh*
	[20] *htr‘yšnw k’rbh*	*hwd nḥrw ’ymh*
	[21] *yḥpwr b‘MQ wyśyś bKḤ*	*yṣ’ lqr’t nšq*
	[22] *yśḥq lpḥd wl’ yḥt*	*wl’ yšwb mpny ḥrb*
	[23] *‘lyw trnh ’šph*	*lhb ḥnyt wkydwn*

[24] *br‘š wrgz ygm’ ’rṣ* *wl’ Y’MYN ky qwl šwpr*
[25] *bdy špr y’mr h’ḥ* *wmrḥwq yryḥ mlḥmh* *r‘m śrym wtrw‘h*

III [26] *hmBYNTk Y’BR NṢ* *yprś KNPw ltymn*
[27] *’m ‘l pyk ygbyh nšr* *wky YRYM qnw*
[28] *SL‘ yškn wytlnn* *‘l šn SL‘ wMṢWDH*

[29] *mšm ḥpr ’KL* *lmrḥwq ‘ynyw ybyṭw*
[30] *w’prḥw y‘l‘w dm* *wb’šr ḥllym šm hw’*

7.1 Text

V. 12a—*yšyb*: so Q (Kroeze, Bezuidenhout; cf. LXX). Most critics follow K and read *yšwb* because they prefer to take *zr‘k* as the first word of the second colon (‘and bring your grain to your threshing floor?’, RSV); against the masoretic accentuation (cf. NJPS and Habel).

V. 13b—*’m ’brh ḥsydh wnṣh*: ‘is her wing (the wing of) a stork or a falcon?’; with Hölscher, Kroeze, Gordis and Van Selms I take *nṣh* as a feminine form of *nṣ* (cf. v. 26a! and Vulg.—‘accipiter’). *’m* introduces the interrogative clause (cf. Judges 1,27). About vv. 13–18 see also H.-P. Müller, *ZAW* 100 (1988), pp. 97–102.

V. 16a—*hqšyḥ*: the masc. of MT is not appropriate here. I read *hqšyḥ* as infinitive absolute.

V. 21a—*yḥpwr*: so all the commentaries (except Kroeze); cf. BHS. MT *yḥprw*.

V. 21a: ‘he paws the valley and exults in strength’ (cf. RSV). Most critics, however, take *bkḥ* with the second colon to obtain two balanced cola. I follow the masoretic accentuation (with Dhorme, RSV, NJPS, Habel).

V. 27b—*wky*: J. Reider (*VT* 4 [1954], p. 294), G.R. Driver (*PEQ* 104 [1972], pp. 64-66) and M. Dahood (*ZAW* 87 [1975], p. 220) saw in MT *ky* another species of ‘vulture’; so also Keel (1978), p. 69 n. 234. According to Gordis, Van Selms and Hartley this is very unlikely (see also NJPS).

7.2 Content

God’s lordship over the animals.

I God’s care for young animals and the urge for freedom of the wild ass/ox.
  I.1 About the growing up of *young* animals in the wild.
    I.1.1 I supply the food for the young lions and the ravens (vv. 39–41).

I.1.2 Do you know the time for the mountain goats to have their young? (vv. 1–2).
Their young grow up (without you being able to influence that process; vv. 3–4).
I.2 About the untameable urge for freedom of the wild ass/ox.
I.2.1 I set the wild ass free (vv. 5–6).
It goes its own way in the wilderness (vv. 7–8).
I.2.2 Can you tame the wild ox? (vv. 9–12).
II God's care for young animals and the urge for freedom of the horse.
II.1 About the stupid carelessness of the *ostrich* with regard to her eggs and *young* (cf. I.1).
An 'ostrich' does not care for her eggs at all (v. 13–15).
She is totally uninterested in the growing up of her young (vv. 16–18).
II.2 About the unbounded warlike spirit of the horse (cf. I.2).
Can you give a horse its terrifying power? (vv. 19–20).
It does not fear the battlefield (vv. 21–23).
With complete abandon it throws itself into the fray (vv. 24–25).
III Summary: about the *freedom* of action of *birds* of prey, their food and their *young*.
Is it by your discernment that hawks and eagles live as high in the rocks as they do? (vv. 26–28).
From this high position they are looking for food for their young (vv. 29–30).

7.3 Transition markers

7.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

7.3.1.1 *h*- interr., v. 39a
h- interr., v. 1a
my, v. 5a
my, v. 5b
h- interr., v. 9a; ext. // *h*-interr. in vv. 10–12
h- interr., v. 19a; ext. // *h*-interr. in v. 20a
h- interr., v. 19b
h- interr., v. 26a

7.3.1.2 no remarks

7.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

7.3.2.1 *'mr*, v. 25a

7.3.2.2 *my*, v. 41a
w- beginning line, v. 15a
w- beginning line, v. 30a
hw', v. 30b

7.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

no remarks

7.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

7.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’br*, vv. 13, 26; *’ḥr*, vv. 8, 10; *’kl*, vv. 41, 29; *’l* (prep.), vv. 41, 11; *’l/’lwh*, vv. 41 and 17 resp.; *’m*, vv. 9, 10, 13, 27; *’mn*, vv. 12, 24; *’rṣ*, vv. 14, 24; *’šr*, vv. 6, 30

b: *b-*, vv. 40, 40, 4, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21, 21, 24, 30; *byn*, vv. 17, 26; *bly*, vv. 41, 16; *bn*, vv. 4, 16

h: *h-* interr., vv. 39, 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 19, 20, 26; *-h*, vv. 14, 15, 15, 16 (3×), 17, 17; *-hm*, vv. 3, 4

w: *-w*, vv. 41, 41, 6, 6, 10, 11 (3×), 12, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30

ḥ: *ḥyh*, vv. 39, 15; *ḥpr*, vv. 21, 29

y: *ygy‘*, vv. 11, 16; *yd‘*, vv. 1, 2; *yld*, vv. 41, 1, 2, 3; *yṣ’*, vv. 4. 21

k: *k-*, vv. 18, 20; *-k*, vv. 9, 9, 10, 11, 12, 12, 26, 27; *kḥ*, vv. 11, 21; *ky*, vv. 40, 41, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 24, 27; *knp*, vv. 13, 26

l: *l-*, vv. 39, 40, 41, 41, 4, 7, 14, 16 (3×), 17, 18, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 29; *l’*, vv. 4, 7, 16, 17, 22, 22, 24; *lyn*, vv. 9, 28

m: *my*, vv. 41, 5, 5; *ml’*, vv. 39, 2; *mn*, vv. 22, 25, 26, 29, 29

n: *nṣ*, vv. 13, 26

s: *sws*, vv. 18, 19; *sl‘*, vv. 1, 28, 28

‘: *‘zb*, vv. 11, 14; *‘l*, vv. 9, 14, 23, 27, 28; *‘mq*, vv. 10, 21; *‘t*, vv. 1, 2, 18

p: *pḥd*, vv. 16, 22

ṣ: *ṣwd*, vv. 39, 41, 28

r: *rbh*, vv. 4, 11; *rwm*, vv. 18, 27; *rḥq*, vv. 25, 29; *rym*, vv. 9, 10; *r‘m*, vv. 19, 25; *r‘š*, vv. 20, 24

ś: *śḥq*, vv. 7, 18, 22

š: *šwb*, vv. 4, 12, 22; *šwpr*, vv. 24, 25; *škn*, vv. 6, 28; *šlḥ*, vv. 3, 5; *šm*, vv. 29, 30

7.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 39–41: *ṣwd*, vv. 39a.41a—inclusio
llby/lbly ’kl, vv. 39a and 41c resp. (alliteration)—inclusio
ky, vv. 40a.41b
vv. 1–2: *yd‘t ‘t ldt*, vv. 1a.2b!
’ylwt/tml’nh, vv. 1b and 2a resp.—alliteration

vv. 3–4: *-hm*, vv. 3b.4a!
vv. 5–6: *wmsrwt/wmšknwtyw*, vv. 5b and 6b resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
vv. 9–10: *h-* interr., vv. 9a.10a—exactly linear
rym, vv. 9a.10a!—linear
’m, vv. 9b.10b—exactly linear
-k, vv. 9b.10b—linear (’rhyme’); see also *-k* in v. 9a
vv. 11–12: *h-* interr., vv. 11a.12a—exactly linear
bw ky, vv. 11a.12a!—linear; see also *-w* in v. 11a+b
-k, vv. 11b.12a+b
vv. 13–15: *-h*, vv. 14a.15a+b
ky, vv. 14a.15a
vv. 16–18: *bnyh/bbynh*, vv. 16a and 17b resp.—alliteration
l’, vv. 16a.17b
lh, vv. 16a.17b!; see also *-h* in vv. 16a+b and 17a
ll’ lh/’lwh, vv. 16a and 17a resp.—alliteration
b-, vv. 17b.18a
vv. 19–20: *h-* interr., vv. 19a.20a—exactly linear; see also *h-* interr. in v. 19b
ṣw’rw r‘mh/nḥrw ’ymh, vv. 19b and 20b resp. (alliteration)—linear
vv. 21–23: *l-*, vv. 21b.22a
ḥrb/ḥnyt, vv. 22b and 23b resp.
vv. 24–25: *šwpr*, vv. 24b.25a!
vv. 26–28: *-k*, vv. 26a.27a
ltymn/wytlnn, vv. 26b and 28a resp. (alliteration)—inclusio
‘l, vv. 27a.28b
vv. 29–30: *šm*, vv. 29a.30b!
ḥpr/’prḥ, vv. 29a and 30a resp.—alliteration

7.4.3 Within the canticles

vv. 1–4: *yld*, vv. 1a+2b.3a—concatenatio
ldtnh/tšlḥnh, vv. 2b and 3b resp. (alliteration)—concat.
vv. 5–8: *-w/-hw*, vv. 6a and 8a resp.—linear; see also *-w* in v. 6b
vv. 9–12: *h-* interr., vv. 9a+10a.11a+12a—exactly linear
-k end colon, vv. 9a+b+10b.11b+12a*; see also *-k* in v. 12b
b-, vv. 10a.11a+12a—concatenatio

7.4.4 Within the sub-cantos

38,39–39,4 (I.1): *ml’*, vv. 39b.2a!

lmw/lmw, vv. 40b and 4b resp.!
yld, vv. 41b.1–3!—concatenatio
vv. 5–12 (I.2): *’ḥr*, vv. 8b.10b!
vv. 13–18 (II.1): *-h*, vv. 14a+15a+b.16 (3×)+17a+b!—concat.
ky, vv. 14a.17a—exactly lin.; see also *ky* in v. 15a
vv. 19–25 (II.2): *gbwrh/wtrw‘h*, vv. 19a and 25c resp. (assonance)—inclusio (Fokkelman)
r‘m, vv. 19b.25c!
r‘š, vv. 20a.24a! } chiasm—inclusio (Fokkelman)
wl’, vv. 22a+b.24b
mn, vv. 22b.25b—linear

7.4.5 WITHIN THE CANTOS

38,39–39,12 (canto I): *my*, vv. 41a.5a+b!—linear
‘rb ṣydw/‘rbh bytw, vv. 41a and 6a resp. (alliter.)—linear
’l (prep.), vv. 41b.11b!—‘inclusio’; see also *’l* (‘God’) in v. 41b
h- interr., vv. 1a.9a—exactly linear; see also *h-* interr. in vv. 10–12
šlḥ, vv. 3b.5a!
yrbw bbr/ky rb, vv. 4a and 11a resp.! (alliter.)—linear
šwb, vv. 4b.12a—linear

vv. 13–25 (canto II): *’brh/k’rbh*, vv. 13b and 20a resp. (alliter.)—linear
’rṣ, vv. 14a.24a!
pḥd, vv. 16b.22a! (Keel, p. 38)
k-, vv. 18a.20a!—concatenatio
śḥq, vv. 18b.22a
lsws, vv. 18b.19a!—concatenatio (Vetter, p. 55)

vv. 26–30 (canto III): *mn*, vv. 26a.29a+b—linear

7.4.6 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

38,39–39,4.13–18.26–30: *ṣwd*, vv. 39a+41a.28b!—linear
wḥyt, vv. 39b.15b!—linear
’rb/’brh/y’br, vv. 40b, 13b and 26a resp.! (alliter.)—linear

’l/ ’lwh, vv. 41b and 17a resp.!
bly, vv. 41c.16b!
’kl, vv. 41c.29a!
‘t, vv. 1a+2b.18a!
sl‘, vv. 1a.28a+b!
ḥll/ḥllym, vv. 1b and 30b resp.—alliter.
bnym, vv. 4a.16a!
knp, vv. 13a.26b!—linear (Bezuidenhout, p. 719)
n‘lsh/ ‘l šn sl‘, vv. 13a and 28b resp. (alliter.) —linear
nṣ, vv. 13b.26a!—linear
bynh, vv. 17b.26a! (Bezuidenhout, p. 719); see also *ḥkmh* in v. 17a!
rwm, vv. 18a.27b!

vv. 5–12.19–25: *yśḥq*, vv. 7a.22a (Bezuidenhout, p. 720)
‘mq, vv. 10b.21a! (Bezuidenhout, p. 720)
kḥ, vv. 11a.21a! (Bezuidenhout, p. 720)
’mn hiph‘il, vv. 12a.24b!—linear

vv. 11–12.13–15, concat.: *t‘zb*, vv. 11b.14a!

7.4.7 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

7.4.7.1 Partially left out of consideration
’m, b-, h- interr., *-w, ky, l-, l’, ‘l, šwb* (v. 22)

7.4.7.2 Totally left out of consideration
’šr, ḥpr, ygy‘, yṣ’, lyn, rḥq, škn

7.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 40,2|38,39–41|39,1–4.5–8.9–12|26–30.13–18.19–25|40,4–5 (1|3|3×4|5.6.7|2)
Stickel (1842): . . . |39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12|13–18.19–25.26–30 (. . . |3.4.4.4| 6.7.5)
Schlottmann (1851): 39–41.1–4|5–8.9–12||13–15.16–18|19–20.21–22.23–25| 26–27.28–30 (3.4|4.4||3.3|2.2.3|2.3)
Ewald (1854): . . . 38,39–39,8*.9–18*.19–30. . . (. . . 12.12.12. . .)
Merx (1871): . . . |39–41*.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–22.23–25*.26–29 (. . . |4×8.6.6.3×8)

Hitzig (1874): . . . ||39–41.1–4|5–8.9–12|13–18.19–22+24–25|26–30 (. . . ||3.4|4.4|6.6|5)

Delitzsch (1876): . . . 39–41|1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30|. . . (. . . 7|3×8.12.15.10|. . .)

Wright (1883): . . . |39–41.1–4.5–8|9–12.19–22.23–25|26.27–30.13–15.16–18 (. . . |7.8.8|8.8.7|2.7.6.6)

Dillmann (1891): . . . |39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30 (. . . |7.3×8. 12.[=6.6].15[=8.7].10)

Ley (1895): 39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–22.23–25.26–30+40,2 (3.4.4.4.6.4.4.6)

Duhm (1897): 39–40.1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.19–20.21–22.23–24b. 24c–25.26–28*.29–30

Vetter (1897): . . . ||39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30; similarly RSV (1952), Rozelaar (1984)

Hontheim (1904): 38,39–41+39,26.27–30|1–4|5–8.9–12|13–18|19–22.23–25 (4.4|4|4.4|6|4.4)

Schlögl (1916): 1–12.19–24+25b–30 (3×8|24)

Löhr (1918): 38,39–39,4|5–12|13–15+18+26–27+29–30|19–25 (4×8)

Peters (1928): 39–41|1–2.3–4|5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16.17–18| 19–20.21–23.24–25|26–27.28–30 (3|2.2|2.2|2.2|2.2.2|2.3.2|2.3)

König (1929): . . . |39–40.41.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30|. . .

Kissane (1939): 39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12; 13–16+18.19–25.26–30 (3×4; 3×5)

Möller (1955): . . . 1–12.13–18.19–30 (. . . 12.6.12)

Fohrer (1963): . . . ||39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12|13–14+16+18.19–22.23–25.26–30* 40,2+8–10.11–14 (. . . ||4×4|4×4 4.4)

Terrien (1963): 39–41.1–4|5–8.9–12|13–15.16–18|19–21.22–25|26–28.29–30

Skehan (1964): . . . ||38,39–40+36+41.39,1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30|| . . . (. . . ||4×4.6.7.5||. . .); cf. NAB (1970)

Keel (1978), pp. 37–38: 39–41.1–4.5–12.13–25.26–30

TOB (1978): . . . |39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30|40,2

De Wilde (1981): . . . |39–40.41*.26–27a+28*.29–30|1–2.3–4.5–6.7–8.9–10. 11–12|13–14.15–16.17–18|19–20.21–22.23–24a*.24b–25|. . .

Van Selms (1983): . . . 38,39–39,12.13–18.19–25.26–30. . .

Webster (1984), p. 99: 39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–15.16–18.19–22.23–25.26–30

Habel (1985): . . . ||39–41.1–4.5–8.9–12|13–18.19–25.26–30. . .

Bezuidenhout (1987): 39–41.1–4.5–8|9–12.13–18|19–25.26–30

Hartley (1988): . . . ||38,25–38|39–41.39,1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30 40,2

Miller (1991): 39–41.1–18.19–25.26–30 (‘linear arrangement’) and 39–40.41.1–4.5–8.9–12.13–18.19–25.26–30 (‘chiastic arrangement’: a1.a2.b.c.c’.b’.a1’.a2’)

7.6 Comments and summary

To a certain extent the division of the second part of God's first speech (38,39–39,30) into smaller units poses no problems (cf. the beginning of 38,2–38). On the basis of the various animals which pass in review, the composition is often divided into 38,39–41, 39,1–4, 5–8, 9–12, 13–18, 19–25 and 26–30.[1] As to the overall structure of the poem, however, Miller rightly observes that 'most commentators see little or no order in this list of animals' (p. 419).[2] Some exegetes, though, assume a main disjunction between 39,12 and 13.[3] According to Westermann this disjunction is found between 39,8 and 9. The unit of 38,39–39,8, then, describes 'Gottes Handeln an den Tieren', and from 39,9 onwards the attention moves to the qualities of the animals.[4] Keel observes that in each case two animals form a pair: God feeds 'the lion and the raven' (38,39–41), sets a time for the calving of 'the ibex and the hind' (39,1–4), sets 'the wild ass and the wild ox' free from the service of man (vv. 5–12), gives 'the ostrich and the horse' their freedom from care and their speed (vv. 13–25), and provides 'the hawk and the eagle' with ample freedom of movement (vv. 26–30).[5]

Recently, the rhetorical structure of the poem has been the subject of two individual studies. According to Bezuidenhout (1987) Hebrew poetry displays a regularity in the alternation of motifs, which on the face of it create the impression of a chaotic sequence. Motifs which alternate according to a systematic pattern have to be identified. The patterns of these motifs function as codes to determine the structure of a poem on the semantic and semiotic level (pp. 709–10). The structure of Job 38,39–39,30, according to Bezuidenhout, is determined by two motifs: a) gifts to the animals ('gawes aan diere'); b) their function ('Die funksie daarvan'). On this basis the poem is supposed to fall into three groups of strophes, 38,39–39,8, 9–18, 19–30. Bezuidenhout's reasoning is primarily based on thematic considerations, nevertheless he also points to some interesting patterns of verbal repetitions; see anal. 7.4.6.[6] Miller (1991) discerns two different frameworks on the level of the poem as a whole, a 'linear arrangement' and a 'chiastic arrangement' (see anal. 7.5). According to the linear arrangement, the animals of 38,39–41 are in search of prey, which includes the animals of 39,1–18; the ostrich (vv. 13–18) laughs at the war horse of vv. 19–25, which carries its rider off to war, where the eagle of vv. 26–30 dines on the corpses. According to the 'chiastic arrangement' 38,39–41 (beast of prey and scavenger bird) correspond with 39,19–30 (animal of war and scavenger bird), 39,1–4 and 13–18 correspond with each other because the mountain goat and the ostrich are described in terms of procreation. At the center of this 'chiasm' are two wild versions of domesticated animals (vv. 5–12).[7]

---

[1] So Stickel, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Vetter, Peters, Kissane, RSV, Skehan, TOB, Westermann (1978, pp. 114–15), Rozelaar, Habel, Hartley; cf. also Ley, König in anal. 7.5 (and Andersen).

[2] See, e.g., Alter: 'The sequence of beasts ... is loosely associative' (1985, p. 102); cf. also De Wilde, p. 357.

[3] So Stickel, Schlottmann, Kissane, Fohrer, Habel; cf. also Köster and Schlögl in anal. 7.5. It is very difficult, however, to find a clear thematic link between the description of the animals in each of these main parts; see, e.g., the descriptive phrases in the translation by Habel: 'The Kingdom of the Wild' (38,39–39,12), 'The ostrich, the Horse, and the Eagle' (39,13–30). The same applies to the thematic characterizations of the main units by Schlottmann and Fohrer.

[4] See Westermann (1978), pp. 116–17; cf. Wright in anal. 7.5.

[5] Keel (1978), pp. 37–38, with reference to Peters, p. 32* (p. 38 n. 112). This approach is not fully satisfactory because the parallelism in 39,1 indicates that the *y'ly sl'* and the *'ylwt* do not represent two different animal species; cf. *pr'* and *'rwd* in 39,5 (see for the latter pair Gordis and Hartley; against M. Dahood, *ZAW* 87 [1975], p. 220). Furthermore, Keel's 'pairs' constitute poetic units which greatly differ in length, namely from three to about thirteen lines.

In my view, the thematic and formal correspondences within the poem of 38,39–39,30 stand out best when we assume that the poem divides into two large, almost identical cantos of 15 and 13 lines respectively, which are rounded off by a smaller canto of five lines. That is to say, the poem displays two main caesuras, a first caesura after v. 12 and a second after v. 25. This framework is primarily based on a thematic and formal parallelism between cantos I and II. Moreover, vv. 26–30—which lines are to be taken as the beginning of an 'incomplete', final canto—join this parallelism, because to some degree they correspond with the beginning of cantos I and II. This *linear* parallelism is in the first place indicated by the verbal repetitions on the level of the poem as whole. From this formal perspective the structure of the poem is especially marked by a cluster of responsions which occur at the beginning of the cantos; note the list of verbal repetitions, which occur in 38,39–39,4, 13–18, 26–30, lined up in anal. 7.4.6. From a thematic point of view the canto division comes to light by the systematic alternation of two motifs: a) God's care for young animals; b) unbounded freedom/passion of certain animal species; cf. anal. 7.2.[8] The first motif, God's providential care for young animals, determines the content of 38,39–39,4 and vv. 13–18. Within the overall design of the poem it is implied that *God* also cares for the young of the ostrich (vv. 13–18). Vv. 26–30 join this linear, semantic parallelism between cantos I and II because, just like 38,41 and 39,13–18, they deal with *birds*. The second motif, unbounded freedom/passion, dominates the content of 39,5–12 (wild ass and wild ox) and 19–25 (horse). Unlike the wild ass and the wild ox, the horse allows its great power to be subjected to the uses of man. But Alter rightly notes that 'as he is described, he gives the virtual impression of joining battle of his own free will, for his own pleasure' (1985, p. 106).[9] In canto III we find the two motifs together in reverse order (see anal. 7.2). In vv. 26–28 we meet with the motif of freedom, and in vv. 29–30 with the motif of care for young animals. Moreover, the noun 'corpses' (of the battlefield; *ḥllym*) in v. 30b reminds us of the horse and its *rider* in v. 18b.[10]

---

[6] The analysis, however, is not fully satisfactory because the strophes mostly contain an aspect of each of the two motifs and the alternation of the motifs in the strophes does not display an evidently regular pattern; see Bezuidenhout, pp. 714–15.

[7] As to Miller's chiastic arrangement I note that the center of his framework corresponds with Keel's third animal pair; see also Hitzig, p. 287. Further, the correspondence between 39,1–4 and 13–18 (procreation) is unmistakable, I think; see also Keel, p. 37. The correspondence between 38,39–40 and 39,19–25, on the other hand, is less obvious! Cf. about the horse in vv. 19–25 M. Görg, 'Die Göttin auf dem Kriegspferd', *BN* 13 (1980), pp. 32–34.

[8] These motifs correspond, I think, with the two aspects Keel discerns in the image

As frequently noted, the poem as a whole is demarcated by a thematic inclusio. The poem opens with some animals of *prey* (the lion and the raven, vv. 39–41) and closes with some animals of *prey* (the eagle and the vulture, vv. 26–28). The animals in between do not display this quality. At the same time the former animals provide their young with food; cf. *'kl* ('to eat') in anal. 7.4.6 (the motif of food is again lacking in the lines in between).[11] Hartley aptly points out that the poem winds up with an allusion to death (v. 30). This is a characteristic device of closure; cf. the speeches by Job in cycles I and II.

I conclude that the most obvious thematic criterion for determining the main breaks between the cantos is not so much a coherence of ideas within the cantos, but rather the regular alternation of specific motifs in one and the same canto (cf. the approach by Bezuidenhout). The thematic

---

of the 'Herr der Tiere'. This figure appears 'bald mehr als Bändiger, bald mehr als Beschützer'; Keel (1978), p. 86.

[9] This analysis confirms the observations by Keel (pp. 37–38) and Habel (p. 524) that the section about the ostrich (vv. 13–18) forms a genuine part of the poem (cf. also H.-P. Müller, *ZAW* 100 [1988], pp. 102–03 and n. 62!); against Bickell, Duhm, Schlögl, Hölscher, and recently Van Oorschot (1987, pp. 11–12 and 176–79). According to Van Oorschot, the insertion of vv. 13–18 is instigated by the 'Stichwortverbindung' in vv. 18 and 19 (*sws*). Analysis 7.4.6 makes it clear that much more can be said from this perspective! The pattern of responsions on the level of the poem as a whole also speaks against Keel's view that v. 17 is to be taken as a gloss; note *'l/'lwh* and *bynh* in anal. 7.4.6 (see also anal. 7.4.2).

[10] Cf. Keel, p. 85. Miller notes, that *ḥll* is almost exclusively used of human corpses after battle (pp. 420–21; with reference to Dhorme and Hartley).

[11] Cf. Hitzig, p. 294; Keel, p. 85; Alter (1985), p. 102; Miller in anal. 7.5. Hontheim and De Wilde fail to appreciate the device of inclusio, when they transpose vv. 26–30 to follow 38,39–41 (see anal. 7.5).

coherence of the cantos is not as obvious as one might wish; cf. above about the main break between vv. 12 and 13. This especially applies to the first canto. The thematic links in the descriptions of the ostrich and the horse in canto II, freedom from care and speed (noted by Keel), only partially meets this consideration. From a formal point of view, however, the relative individuality of the cantos is clearly enhanced by analysis 7.4.5; note *my* (‘who?), preposition *’l*, *šlḥ* (‘to set free’), *rbh* (‘to become many’), *’rṣ* (‘earth’), *pḥd* (‘fear’), preposition *k-*, *lsws* (‘to the horse’).

The motifs which relieve each other in the cantos at the same time determine the demarcation of the ‘sub-cantos’, 38,39–39,4, 5–12, 13–18, 19–25; see analyses 7.2 and 7.4.4. Note also *my* (‘who’), *h-* interr., *rbh* (‘to become many’) and *šwb* (‘to return’) in anal. 7.4.5. Arithmetically seen the sub-cantos display an interesting, carefully thought-out pattern. The sum totals of the lines of the sub-cantos in cantos I and II constitute rising series: 7 > 8 and 6 > 7 resp. The sum totals of the lines of the corresponding sub-cantos constitute falling series: 7 (I.1) > 6 (II.1) > 5 (III) and 8 (I.2) > 7 (II.2). The sub-cantos of canto I describe more than one animal each, the sub-cantos of canto II only one animal each. Primarily on this basis the sub-cantos of canto I fall apart into two canticles, 38,39–41.39,1–4 (lion/raven and mountain goat) and 39,5–8.9–12 (wild ass and wild ox); cf. anal. 7.2. The analysis of the verbal repetitions does not contribute to this canticle division.

The first canto of the poem is dominated by strophes of two lines, but opens with a three-line strophe; cf. analyses 7.2 and 7.4.2.[12] In canto II there are more three-line strophes than strophes with two lines. See for the strophic structure of this canto analyses 7.2 and 7.4.2.[13] The strophic structure of canto III is especially based on thematic grounds; see anal. 7.2.[14]

The *quintessential thought* of the poem is to be found in the opening strophes of the cantos: *God cares for young animals*, 38,39–39,4, 13–18, 29–30. In the preceding poem we found a matching idea at the end of the cantos: creation of the universe has a *beneficial effect* in the human domain. From this perspective the two poems of God’s first speech form a symmetric pair. The main themes of this pair complement each other. Thus, on the basis of his analysis of the form of God’s first speech, Westermann rightly deduces, I think, that the motif of God's care for young animals contains an obvious reference to God's providential grace, 'nicht nur an den Tieren'.[15] This outcome militates against Miller's negative conclusion as to the position of man in God's creation. According to this critic 'man is unnecessary' and 'may be seen as a bit player in the food chain' (pp. 420–21).[16]

---

[12] So also Peters; cf. Duhm and De Wilde. The animals of prey and the care for their young unite vv. 39–41 in one strophe. On the basis of the different animal species (lion and raven) it can be argued that we are dealing with two strophes, vv. 39–40 and 41; see König and Miller in anal. 7.5 (so also Andersen).

[13] Cf. Schlottmann, Merx, Wright, Dillmann, Peters and Webster in anal. 7.5.

[14] See also Terrien in anal. 7.5.

---

[15] Westermann (1978), p. 118.

[16] So also Alter (1985), p. 104; and cf. anal. 6.6 above.

8 YHWH’s second reply to Job: Job 40,7–41,26

Structure: 8.22.23 > 8|11.11|6.8.9 > 3.3.2||4.4.3|4.4.3||3.3|4.4|4.3.2

I	[7] *’zr* **n’** *kgbr ḥlṣyk*	*’š’lk whwdy‘ny*
	[8] *h’p tpr mšpṭy*	*tršy‘ny lm‘n tṣdq*
	[9] *w’m zrw‘ k’l lk*	*wbqwl kmhw tr‘m*

[10] *‘dh* **n’** *g’wn wGBH*	*whwd whdr tlbš*
[11] *hpṣ ‘brwt ’pk*	*wR’H KL g’h whšpylhw*
[12] *R’H KL g’h hkny‘hw*	*whdk rš‘ym tḥtm*

[13] *ṭmnm b‘PR yḥd*	*pnyhm ḥbš bṭmwn*
[14] *wGM ’ny ’wdk*	*KY twš‘ lk ymynk*

II.1	[15] *hnh n’ bhmwt*	*’šr ‘*ŚYTY **‘mk**	*ḥṣyr kbqr y’kl*
	[16] *hnh n’ kḥw bmtnyw*	*w’nw bšryry bṭnw*	
	[17] *yḥpṣ znbw kmw ’rz*	*gydy pḥdw yśrgw*	
	[18] *‘ṣmyw ’PYQY nḥwšh*	*grmyw kmṭyl brzl*	

[19] *hw’* **r’šyt** *drky ’l*	*h‘*ŚW *ngś* **ḥbrw**
[20] *ky bwl hrym yś’w lw*	*wkl ḥyt hśdh* **yśḥqw** *šm*
[21] *tḥt ṣ’lym yškb*	*bstr qnh wbṣh*
[22] *yskhw ṣ’lym* **ṣllw**	*YSBWhw ‘rby nḥl*

[23] **hn** *y‘šq nhr*	**l’** *yḥpwz*
ybṭḥ **ky** *ygyḥ*	*yrdn* **’l** *pyhw*
[24] *b‘ynyw yqḥnw*	*bmwqšym ynqb ’p*

II.2	[25] *tmšk lwytn bḥkh*	*wbḥbl tšqy‘ lšnw*
	[26] *htśym ’gmwn b’pw*	*wbḥwḥ tqwb lḥyw*
	[27] *hyrbh ’lyk tḥnwnym*	*’m ydbr ’lyk rkwt*
	[28] *hykrt bryt* **‘mk**	*tqḥnw l‘bd ‘wlm*

[29] **htśḥq** *bw kṣpwr*	*wtqšrnw ln‘rwtyk*
[30] *ykrw ‘lyw* **ḥbrym**	*yḥṣwhw byn kn‘nym*
[31] *html’ bśkwt ‘wrw*	*wbṣlṣl dgym* **r’šw**
[32] *śym ‘lyw kpk*	*zkr mlḥmh ’l twsp*

[1] **hn** *tḥltw nkzbh*	*GM* **’l** *MR’Yw yṭl*
[2] **l’** *’kzr KY y‘wrnw*	*wmy HW’ lpny ytyṣb*
[3] *my hqdymny w’šlm*	*tḥt KL hšmym ly HW’*

III.1 [4] *l’ ’ḥryš bdyw*   *wdbr gbwrwt wḥyn ‘rkw*
[5] *my glh pny lbwšw*   *bkpl srynw my* YBW’
[6] *dlty pnyw my ptḥ*   *SBYBWT šnyw ’ymh*

[7] *gwh ’PYQY mgnym*   *sgwr ḥwtm ṣr*
[8] *’ḥd b’ḥd ygšw*   *wrwḥ l’* YBW’ *bynyhm*
[9] *’yš b’ḥyhw* **ydbqw**   *ytlkdw wl’ ytprdw*

III.2 [10] *‘ṭyštyw thl ’wr*   *w‘ynyw k‘p‘py šḥr*
[11] *mpyw lpydym yhlkw*   *kydwdy ’š ytmlṭw*
[12] *mnḥyryw yṣ’ ‘šn*   *kdwd npwḥ w’gm*
[13] *npšw gḥlym tlhṭ*   *wlhb mpyw yṣ’*

[14] *bṣw’rw ylyn ‘z*   *wlpnyw tdwṣ d’bh*
[15] *mply bśrw* **dbqw**   *yṣwq ‘lyw bl ymwṭ*
[16] *lbw yṣwq kmw ’bn*   *wyṣwq kplḥ tḥtyt*
[17] *mśtw ygwrw ’lym*   *mšbrym ytḥṭ’w*

III.3 [18] *mśyghw ḥrb* BLY *tqwm*   *ḥnyt ms‘ wšryh*
[19] *yḥšb ltbn brzl*   *l‘ṣ rqbwn nḥwšh*
[20] *l’ ybryḥnw bn qšt*   *lqš nhpkw lw ’bny ql‘*
[21] *kqš nḥšb lw twtḥ*   *wyśḥq lr‘š kydwn*

[22] *tḥtyw ḥdwdy ḥrś*   *yrpd ḥrwṣ ‘ly ṭyṭ*
[23] *yrtyḥ ksyr mṣwlh*   *ym yśym kmrqḥh*
[24] *’ḥryw y’yr ntyb*   *yḥšb thwm lśybh*

[25] *’yn ‘l ‘PR mšlw*   *h‘św l*BLY *ḥt*
[26] *’t KL GBH YR’H*   *HW’ mlk ‘l KL bny šḥṣ*

8.1 Text

40,19b—*h‘św ngś ḥbrw*: ‘he who was made a tyrant to his fellows’; so Duhm, Budde, Driver-Gray, Dhorme, Hölscher, Fohrer, De Wilde, NAB, NEB, HAL (cf. Hontheim). For *h‘św* as ‘he who was made’ cf. LXX and 41,25. MT *h‘św ygš ḥrbw* (‘let him that made him bring near his sword’); so Vulg., König, RSV, Kroeze, Pope, Kubina (1979, p. 23), Hartley (cf. NJPS, Habel and B. Couroyer, *RB* 84 [1977], pp. 59–79).

V. 20a—*bwl*: meaning of Hebrew uncertain. HAL: ‘Ertrag; Tribut; Getier’.

V. 23: if a normal bicolon, especially the second colon would be overloaded (cf. Pope and Habel). I take this verse as two bicola; this interpretation is supported by the rhythmical structure of v. 24 (note v. 24a) and the parallel strophe in canticle II.2 (41,1–3).

V. 24: the 3 pers. sing. of the verbs expresses the indefinite personal subject ('can one capture it?' etc.); so Hartley (cf. GKC § 144d).

41,1b—*gm*: in MT preceded by *h-* interr. This particle is to be deleted as dittography (so König, Fohrer, Van Selms, BHS; cf. Dhorme).

V. 2b—*lpny*: 'before me' (so MT); Schlottmann, Budde, Driver-Gray (I, pp. 363–64), Westermann (1978, p. 121), Keel (1978, p. 43 n. 129), Kubina (1979, p. 24), Habel. Most critics read *lpnyw* ('before him'; cf. BHS). See also below, about v. 3a.

V. 3a: many critics emend the first colon to read the third person: 'Who has confronted him and come out safe' (Duhm, Dhorme, Hölscher, Fohrer, Gordis, Pope, Van Selms, among others). This wording is supposed to fit the context better. Hartley follows MT as the harder reading; see also the critics mentioned with v. 2b and J.C.L. Gibson, 'A New Look at Job 40,1–4', in JSOTS 138, 1992, pp. 129–39. This reading is supported by the canto structure; see anal. 8.6.

V. 3b—*ly*: so MT; see H. Rowold, *JBL* 105 (1986), pp. 104–09. Many critics read *l'*; Pope and Kubina (1979, p. 24): *my* (cf. v. 3a).

V. 4b—*ḥyn*: meaning of Hebrew uncertain (cf. HAL).

V. 5b—*srynw*: 'coat of mail' (cf. LXX; with many critics). MT *rsnw* ('its halter'); cf. De Wilde.

V. 7a—*gwh*: 'its back' (see BHS); with most scholars. MT *g'wh* ('pride').

V. 12b—*'gm**: 'boiling/hot'; so Bickell, Dhorme, Fohrer, Pope, Van Selms, Hartley, HAL, NJPS. MT *'gmn* ('reeds'); the final *n* is probably due to dittography (see *npšw* in v. 13a).

V. 17b—*mšbrym*: meaning obscure (litt.: 'at the breakings').

V. 21a—*nḥšb lw*: 'is considered by him'; so Dillmann, Budde, Dhorme, Hölscher, Fohrer, Gordis, De Wilde. MT *nḥšbw* ('they are considered'); so Van Selms.

8.2 Content

God's most wonderful creatures.

I Theme: challenge to Job to put an end to the power of the wicked.
    Would you condemn me so that you might be right? (vv. 7–9).
    Adorn yourself with glory and try to destroy the wicked (vv. 10–12).
    If you conquer the wicked I will praise you (vv. 13–14).
II Development: no one can hold out before God.
    II.1 God's creature Behemoth.
        Look at the powerful body of my Behemoth (vv. 15–18).
        The world is at the disposal of my most eminent creature (vv. 19–22).
        It is secure in all circumstances (vv. 23–24).

II.2 No one can hold out before God.
You cannot catch Leviathan (vv. 25–26), nor tame it (vv. 27–28).
You cannot bargain over it (vv. 29–30), nor overpower it (vv. 31–32).
Conclusion: man cannot defeat it; hence, no one can hold his own in confrontation with Me (vv. 1–3; cf. 40,7–14).

III Coda: description of the body of Behemoth/Leviathan.
III.1 Impenetrable (Leviathan).
No one is able to penetrate its inner parts (vv. 4–6; *inside*).
Its *back* is an impenetrable armature (vv. 7–9; *outside*).
III.2 Frightening (Behemoth).
Its inner parts are like an oven and a boiling pot (vv. 10–13; *inside*).
Its body is a bundle of frightening power (vv. 14–17; *outside*).
III.3 Summary (Behemoth/Leviathan).
Invincible: it cannot be overpowered by a weapon (vv. 18–21; cf. vv. 1–3).
Frightening: with its *belly* it turns over the earth and the sea (vv. 22–24; *outside*).
Incomparable: it is the most wonderful creature on earth (vv. 25–26; cf. 40,19–22).

8.3 Transition markers

8.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

8.3.1.1 imperative: *’zr*, 40,7a
n’, 40,7a
imperative: *hwdy‘*, 40,7b
imperative: *‘dh*, 40,10a; ext. // *hpṣ* in v. 11a, and *r’h* in vv. 11b, 12a
n’, 40,10a
imperative: *ṭmn*, 40,13a
imperative: *ḥbš*, 40,13b
hnh, 40,15a; ext. // *hnh* in 40,16a
n’, 40,15a; ext. // *n’* in 40,16a
hw’, 40,19a
hn, 40,23a
h- interr., 40,29a; ext. // *h*- interr. in v. 31a
hn, 41,1a
ḥrš, 41,4a

8.3.1.2 *gm*, 41,1b

8.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

8.3.2.1 *rš'*, 40,12b
gm, 40,14a
'wlm, 40,28b
'l (prohib.), 40,32b

8.3.2.2 *w*- beginning line, 40,9a
w- beginning line, 40,14a
'ny, 40,14a
h- interr., 40,28a; ext. // *h*- interr. in vv. 26a and 27a
my, 41,3a; ext. // *my* in v. 2b
hw', 41,3b; ext. // *hw'* in v. 2b
my, 41,6a; ext. // *my* in vv. 5a and b
hw', 41,26b

8.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

h- interr., 40,8a
'p, 40,8a
lm'n, 40,8b

8.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

8.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

': *'bn*, 41,16, 20; *'gmwn*, 40,26, 41,12*; *'wr*, 41,10, 24; *'ḥd*, 41,8, 8; *'l* ('God'), 40,9, 19, 41,17; *'l* (prep.), 40,23, 27, 27, 41,1—see also *'l* (prohib.) in 40,32; *'m*, 40,9, 27; *'p*, 40,11, 24, 26—see also *'p* in 40,8; *'pyq*, 40,18, 41,7

b: *b*-, 40,9, 13, 13, 16, 16, 21, 24, 24, 25, 25, 26, 26, 29, 31, 31, 41,5, 8, 9, 14; *bw'*, 41,5, 8; *byn*, 40,30, 41,8; *bly*, 41,18, 25—see also *bl* in 41,15; *bn*, 41,20, 26; *brzl*, 40,18, 41,19

g: *g'h*, 40,10, 11, 12, 41,7*; *gbh*, 40,10, 41,26; *gbr*, 40,7, 41,4; *gm*, 40,14, 41,1

d: *dbr*, 40,27, 41,4; *dbq*, 41,9, 15

h: *h*- (article), 40,19, 20, 41,3, 25; *h*- interr., 40,8, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 41,1*; -*hw*, 40,9, 11, 12, 22, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 41,2, 9, 18, 20; *hw'*, 40,19, 41,2, 3, 26; -*hm*, 40,13, 41,8; *hn*, 40,23, 41,1; *hnh*, 40,15, 16

w: -*w*, 40,16 (4×), 17, 17, 18, 18, 19, 20, 21*, 22, 24, 25, 26, 26, 29, 30, 31, 31, 32, 41,1, 1, 4, 4, 5, 5, 6, 6, 10, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 14, 15, 15, 16, 17, 21*, 22, 24, 25

ḥ: *ḥbr*, 40,19*, 30; *ḥrb*, 40,19*, 41,18; *ḥšb*, 41,19, 21, 24

ṭ: *ṭmn*, 40,13, 13

y: -*y*, 40,8, 41,2, 3; *yṣ'*, 41,12, 13; *yṣq*, 41,15, 16, 16

k: *k-*, 40,7, 9, 9, 15, 17, 18, 29, 41,10, 12, 16, 16, 21, 23, 23; *-k*, 40,7, 7, 9, 11, 14 (3×), 15, 27, 27, 28, 29, 32; *ky*, 40,14, 20, 23, 41,2; *kl*, 40,11, 12, 20, 41,3, 26, 26

l: *l-*, 40,8, 9, 14, 20, 28, 29, 41,2, 3, 14, 19, 19, 20, 20, 21*, 21, 24, 25; *l'*, 40,23, 41,2, 4*, 8, 9, 20; *lbš*, 40,10, 41,5; *lqḥ*, 40,24, 28

m: *-m*, 40,12, 13; *-mw*, 40,9, 17, 41,16; *my*, 41,2, 3, 5, 5, 6; *mn*, 41,11, 12, 13, 17, 17

n: *n'*, 40,7, 10, 15, 16; *ngš*, 40,19*, 41,8; *nḥwšh*, 40,18, 41,19; *-ny*, 40,7, 8, 41,3; *nqb*, 40,24, 26; *nś'*, 40,20, 41,17

s: *sbb*, 40,22, 41,6

': *'wr/'wr*, 40,31 and 41,2 resp.; *'yn*, 40,24, 41,10; *'l*, 40,30, 32, 41,15, 22 (*'ly*), 25, 26; *'m*, 40,15, 28; *'pr*, 40,13, 41,25; *'śh*, 40,15, 19, 41,25

p: *ph*, 40,23, 41,11, 13; *pnh*, 40,13, 41,2, 5, 6, 14

ṣ: *ṣ'l*, 40,21, 22

q: *qš*, 41,20, 21

r: *r'h*, 40,11, 12, 41,1, 26; *r'š*, 40,19, 31; *rš'*, 40,8, 12

ś: *śḥq*, 40,20, 29, 41,21; *śym*, 40,26, 32, 41,23

t: *tḥt*, 40,12, 21, 41,3, 16, 22

8.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

40,7–9:	*'zr n' k-/zrw' k'l*, vv. 7a and 9a resp. (alliter.)—inclusio *'š'lk/k'l lk*, vv. 7b and 9a resp. (alliter.)—inclusio *-ny*, vv. 7b.8b
vv. 10–12:	*g'h*, vv. 10a.11b.12a *r'h kl*, vv. 11b.12a
vv. 15–18:	*hnh n'*, vv. 15a.16a!—exactly linear *bhmwt/bmtnyw*, vv. 15a and 16a resp. (alliter.)—linear
vv. 19–22:	*h-* (article), vv. 19b.20b *ṣ'lym*, vv. 21a.22a!—linear; see also *ṣllw* in v. 22a (alliter.)
vv. 25–28:	*h-* interr., vv. 26a.27a.28a—exactly linear
vv. 29–32:	*h-* interr., vv. 29a.31a—exactly linear *'lyw*, vv. 30a.32a—linear
41,1–3:	*my*, vv. 2b.3a *hw'*, vv. 2b.3b *-y*, vv. 2b.3b
vv. 4–6:	*my*, vv. 5a+b.6a *pnym*, vv. 5a.6a
vv. 7–9:	*b'ḥd/b'ḥyhw*, vv. 8a and 9a resp.—alliteration

vv. 10–13: *mpyw*, vv. 11a.13b; see also *mn* in v. 12a
kydwdy/*kdwd*, vv. 11b and 12b resp.—alliteration
yṣ’, vv. 12a.13b!
vv. 14–17: *yṣwq*, vv. 15b.16a+b!
tḥtyt/*ytḥṭ’w*, vv. 16b and 17b resp. (alliter.)—linear
vv. 18–21: *ḥšb*, vv. 19a.21a
qš, vv. 20b.21a!; see also *qšt* in v. 20a (alliter.)
vv. 25–26: *‘l*, vv. 25a.26b

8.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

40,15–24 (II.1): *‘śh*, vv. 15b.19b—linear
40,25–41,3 (II.2): *h*- interr., 40,26–28.29+31—concatenatio
śym, 40,26a.32a
‘wr/*‘wr*, 40,31a and 41,2a resp.!—alliter.
41,4–9 (III.1): *ybw’*; vv. 5b.8b!—linear
41,10–17 (III.2): *mn*, vv. 11a.12a.13b.17a+b!—linear
41,18–26 (III.3): *bly*, vv. 18a.25b!—linear
bn, vv. 20a.26b!
ḥšb, vv. 21a.24b—linear; see also v. 19a!
twtḥ/*tḥtyw*, vv. 21a and 22a resp. (alliter.)—concat.

8.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

40,7–14 (canto I): *n’*, vv. 7a.10a—exactly linear
’p/*’p*, vv. 8a and 11a resp. (alliter.)—linear
rš‘, vv. 8b.12b!
w- beginning line, vv. 9a.14a—exactly linear;
  note *w’m* and *wgm* resp.
lk, vv. 9a.14b!—linear
whdk/*’wdk*, vv. 12b and 14a resp. (alliteration)
  —linear
-*m*, vv. 12b.13a!—concatenatio

40,15–41,3 (canto II): *bhmwt*/*lwytn*, 40,15a and 25a resp.!—linear
‘mk, 40,15b.28a!—linear
r’š, 40,19a.31b!—linear
ṣllw/*wbṣlṣl*, 40,22a and 31b resp. (allit.)—lin. }
  chiasm; see also *ṣ’l* in 40,21a and 22a
ḥbr, 40,19b*.30a!—linear } chiasm
śḥq, 40,20b.29a—linear

hn, 40,23a.41,1a!—exactly linear
ky, 40,23c.41,2a—linear (cf. also *ky* in 40,20a)
’l (prep.), 40,23d.41,1b—linear
lqḥ, 40,24a.28b!—concatenatio
nqb, 40,24b.26b!—concatenatio
’p, 40,24b.26a—concatenatio

41,4–26 (canto III): *dbq*, vv. 9a.15a!—linear
’wr, vv. 10a.24a!
’bn, vv. 16a.20b!
tḥtyt . . . ytḥṭ’w/ḥt, vv. 16–17 and 25b resp. (alliter.)—linear

8.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

40,7–14.25–41,3.14–26: *-ny*, vv. 40,7b+8b.41,3a!
h- interr., 40,8a.26–29+31!
-y, 40,8a.41,2b+3b!
’m, 40,9a.27b!—linear
gbh, 40,10a.41,26a!
r’h, 40,11b+12a.41,1b.26a!
kl, 40,11b+12a.41,3b.26a+b
hkny‘hw/kn‘nym, 40,12a and 30b resp.!—alliter. (linear); cf. Judg. 4,23 (Fokkelman)
‘pr, 40,13a.41,25a!—linear
pnym, 40,13b.41,2b—linear
gm, 40,14a.41,1b!—linear
ky, 40,14b.41,2a—linear
śym, 40,26a+32a.41.23b!
śḥq, 40,29a.41,21b; see also 40,20b (cf. 3× *śḥq* in 38,39–39,30; Fokkelman)
hw’, 41,2b+3b.26b—linear

40,15–24.41,4–13: *’pyqym*, 40,18a.41.7a! } chiasm
sbb, 40,22b.41,6b!
ph, 40,23d.41,11a+13b!—linear } chiasm
‘ynyw, 40,24a.41,10b!—linear

41,1–3.4–6, concatenatio: *my*, 41,2b+3a.5a+b+6a!
pnym, 41,2b.5a+6a

note also -*k* in 40,7–32!

8.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

8.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

’l (prep.), *g’h** (41,7), *h-* (article), *hw’* (40,19), -*w*, *ky* (40,20), *kl* (40,20), *l’*, *‘l*, *‘śh* (41,25), *pnh* (41,14)

8.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

(*’ḥd*), *’l* (‘God’), *b-*, *byn*, *brzl*, *gbr*, *dbr*, -*hw*, -*hm*, (*ṭmn*), *k-*, *l-*, *lbš*, -*mw*, (*ngš*), *nḥwšh*, *nś’*, *tḥt*

8.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 40,7–9.10–14|15–19.20–24|25–26.27–29.30–32|41,1–3.4–6. 7–9.10–13.14–17.18–21.22–24.25–26|... (3.5|5.5|2.3.3|3.3.3.4.4.4.3.2| ...)

Stickel (1842): 40,7–9|10–14.15–19.20–24|25–26|27–29.30–32.41,1–3.4–6. 7–9|10–13.14–17.18–21|22–26 (3|5.5.5|2|5×3|4.4.4|5)

Schlottmann (1851): 40,7–9.10–14.15–19.20–24|25–26.27–29.30–32.41,1–3| 4–6.7–9.10–13|14–17.18–21.22–26 (18.11.10.13 > 3.5.5.5|2.3.3.3| 3.3.4|4.4.5); cf. Stickel (1842)

Ewald (1854): 40,7–14.42,2–6; 40,15–24.25–41,3.4–14.15–24.25–26

Merx (1871): ...|40,7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14|... (...|4×4|...)

Delitzsch (1876): 40,7–9.10–14.15–18.19–24.25–29.30–41,1|2–3.4–6.7–9. 10–13.14–17.18–21.22–26|... (6.10.9.12.10.9|4.6.6.8.8.8.10|...)

Wright (1883): 40,7–8.9–11.12–14; 15–18.19–21.22–23|25–26+24+27. 28–31.32–41,3|4–6.7–9.10–13|14–17.18–21.22–26 (4.6.6; 8.6.4|8.8.8| 6.6.8|8.8.8, ‘later addition’)

Dillmann (1891): 40,7–14; 15–18.19–24|25–41,3|4–26 (later addition)

Bickell (1894): 40,2+8.9–10.11–12.13–14; 15–16.17–18.20–21.25–26.27–28. 29–30.31–32.41,5–6.7–8.10+12.13–14.15*+16*+17.18*+20a+19. 20b+21b–22.23–24.25–26 (‘Anhang’)

Ley (1895): 40,7–14 (=7–10.11–14); 15–24.25–32|41,1–3.4–6.7–9.10–13. 14–17.18–21.22–25.26 (8; 10.8|3×3.4×4.1, ‘Interpolation’)

Vetter (1897): 40,7|8–9.10–11.12–13|14||15–24.25–41,26

Hontheim (1904): 40,15–19.41,25+1–3+26|40,20–24|25–28.29–32|41,4–6| 7–9.22–24|10–13|14–17.18–21 (5.5|5|4.4|3|3.3|4|4.4)

Peters (1928): 40,7–9.10–11.12–14 (3.2.3); 15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22. 23–24 (5×2); 25–26.27–28.29–30.31–32.41,1–3|4–6.7–9.10–11.12–13. 14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–24.25–26 (4×2.3|3.3.6×2.3.2 = 34)

König (1929): 40,7–14.15–24.25–41,26; similarly Hartley (1988)
Kissane (1939): 40,2+4–5+7–9.10–14|15–18+41,17+40,19.20–24|25–30. 31–41,3|4–9.10–14.15–21*.22–26|… (6.5.6.5 etc.)
RSV (1952): 40,7–14.15–18.19–24.25–41,3.4–26
Möller (1955): 40,7–8.9–14.15–18.19–24.25–41,4.5–14.15–26 (2.6.4.6.12.10.12)
Fohrer (1963): …40,2+8–10.11–14 (…4.4); 15–24 (‘Zusatz’); 25–30. 31–41,4|5–8+10.11–15.17–21.22–26 (2×6|4×5, ‘Zusatz’)
Terrien (1963): 40,7–9.10–14; 15–16.17–19|20–22.23–24; 25–26.27–29| 30–32.41,1–3|4–6.7–9|10–11.12–14|15–16.17–21|22–24.25–26
Skehan (1964): …||40,7–8.9–11a+12–14|15–19.20–24|25–30.31–41,3.4–9. 10–14.15–21(?).22–26(?) (…||2.5|5.5|6.5.6.5.6.5); cf. Kissane (1939)
NAB (1970): 40,7–8.9–11a+12–14.15–24.25–32.41,2+1+3.4–9.10–14. 16–21.22–26; cf. Skehan (1964)
TOB (1978): 40,7–14|15–24|25–32.41,1–3.4–9.10–21.22–26
De Wilde (1981): …|40,15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22.23–24|25–26.27–28. 29–30.31–32.41,2+1.3–4|40,2+8.9–10.11–12.13–14; 41,5–6.7–8.10–11. 12–13.14–15.16+22.18–19.20–21.23–24.25–26 (‘Glosse’)
Van Selms (1983): 40,7–14.15–24.25–41,1.2–9.10–17.18–26
Webster (1984): 40,8–10.11–14.15–19.20–24.25–28.29–32.41,1–4.5–9.10–13. 14–17.18–21.22–26
Habel (1985): 40,7–14|15.16–18.19.20–23.24 (a.b.a’.b’.a’’)|25–32.41,1–4. 5–21 (= 5–9.10–13.14–17.18–21.22–24).25–26
Bezuidenhout (1986): 40,7–9.10–14||15–19.20–24||25–29.30–41,1.2–4|5–9. 10–13.14–16|17–21.22–24.25–26||… (…||5.5||5.4.3|5.4.3|5.3.2||…)

8.6 Comments and summary

In what way are the speeches by God an answer to his suffering servant Job? In this respect God’s second reply in 40,7–41,26 is even more problematic than his first speech (chs. 38–39). Furthermore, the speeches are introduced by a similar heading; see 38,1 and 40,6. And scholars have frequently been wondering about the meaning of a double answer from the whirlwind. Hence, the integrity of God’s second reply is much disputed and often denied.[1] The conclusion seemed obvious that God’s second speech displays one or more large, secondary expansions. Thus, the descriptions of Behemoth (40,15–24) and Leviathan (40,25–41,26) are often supposed to be such large glosses, descriptions of nature from another source.[2] According to Driver-Gray and Vermeylen God's second reply as a whole (40,6–41,26) is of secondary origin.[3] Budde, Ruprecht,[4] and De Wilde only take the extensive description of the animal body in 41,4–26 as a later addition (De Wilde: 41,5–26). Westermann concludes that 40,15–24 (about Behemoth) and 41,4–26 constitute secondary expansions (1978, p. 124). It can be observed, however, that since the pioneering research by Keel[5] and Kubina[6] commentators have been inclined to make an attempt to interpret the two speeches by God as they stand in MT.[7] Nevertheless, the literary-critical approach, which deletes major sections from God's second reply to Job, has recently found remarkable advocates in Maag (1982) and Van Oorschot (1987). In my view, as far as the integrity of this second reply is concerned, the opinion can be substantiated that there are no later additions at all, which mar the poem.[8] This standpoint is grounded on two complementary, rhetorical approaches: a rhetorical analysis of the poem in 40,7–41,26 itself (see below); and a rhetorical analysis of the framework of the book of Job as a whole (see part VII, 2.5–6). On these grounds I assume that God's second reply to Job (40,7–41,26) in its entirety constitutes a close, relatively self-contained unity.

---

[1] See J. van Oorschot, *Gott als Grenze. Eine literar- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Gottesreden des Hiobbuches* (BZAW 170), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.

When first looking into 40,7–41,26 the overall structure of God's second speech appears to be pretty clear. After an introduction (40,7–14), the speech seems to fall into two sections of very unequal length. The first of these sections deals with some creature named 'Behemoth' (40,15–24; 10/11 lines), the second section with a 'Leviathan' (40,25–41,26; 34 lines). And there is some scholarly agreement that the description of Behemoth points to a hippopotamus, and the description of Leviathan to a crocodile.[9] A more thorough investigation reveals, however, that the overall structure of this poem is determined by yet other constituents than the Behemoth and the Leviathan. Westermann (1978, pp. 120–21) points out that the weapons described in 41,18–21 are quite different from those described in 40,25–26.31. The weapons mentioned in 40,25–26.31 are used to catch an aquatic animal, those mentioned in 41,18–21 are *only* used to catch a land animal. And Van Selms notes that 41,10–21 could be part of the description of the hippopotamus (p. 209). Far more important in this respect is the fact that—amidst the supposedly uninterrupted description of the Leviathan—we meet some lines in which God raises the central issue in the interrogation of Job; note 41,2–3. These lines point to a (final?) conclusion.[10] These observations show that the names of Behemoth and Leviathan in 40,15 and 25 resp. do not unequivocally determine the overall structure of the poem. Schlottmann's strophic analysis partially meets this objection. This exegete divides the poem into four strophes (40,7–24, 25–41,3, 4–13, 14–26; see anal. 8.5). The first and the second strophe, according to Schlottmann, join together in a higher unit, just like the third and the fourth strophe. Next, it is noted: 'In dem ersten Strophenpaare ist der Gedanke, daß Hiob, der gegen Gott zu kämpfen gewagt habe, es nicht einmal mit zwei gewaltigen Kreaturen desselben aufnehmen könne, in gewisser Weise bereits abgeschlossen. Dieser Gedanke wird aber nicht geschwächt, sondern verstärkt dadurch, daß das Letzte jener beiden Ungeheuer noch ausführlicher beschrieben ... wird' (pp. 489–90). As far as the overall structure of God's second reply to Job is concerned, Schlottmann has observed here a fundamental rhetorical aspect. As objection to his framework, I note that it does no justice to 40,7–14 as a relatively independent opening unit. Thus, in my view, the poem consists of *two almost identical* cantos with 22 and 23 lines resp. (40,15–41,3 and 4–26), which are preceded by a canto of eight lines (40,7–14).[11]

---

[2] So, among others, Dillmann, Wright, Bickell, Ley, Duhm, Schlögl, Hölscher, Fohrer, Van Oorschot.

[3] See J. Vermeylen, *Job, ses amis et son dieu* (Studia Biblica 2), Leiden: Brill, 1986, pp. 25–28 and cf. V. Maag, *Hiob, Wandlung und Verarbeitung des Problems in Novelle, Dialogdichtung und Spätfassungen* (FRLANT 128), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

[4] See E. Ruprecht, 'Das Nilpferd im Hiobbuch', *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 209–31.

[5] O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob* (FRLANT 121), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

[6] V. Kubina, *Die Gottesreden im Buche Hiob. Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um die Einheit von Hiob 38,1–42,6* (Freiburger theologische Studien 115), Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 1979.

[7] See Van Selms, Habel and Hartley (note pp. 30–33); for this standpoint see also earlier commentators like Weiser, Andersen, Gordis.

[8] This view may appear rather naive to some critics. On the other hand, it can be observed that advocates of the literary- and/or form-critical approaches generally show a perplexing lack of respect for the poetic beauty and structure of the Hebrew text as it has come down to us.

---

[9] See Keel (1978), pp. 127–32 (about Behemoth) and 141–43 (about Levithan); De Wilde, pp. 380–81 (about Behemoth) and 385–86 (about Leviathan); furthermore, Keel, *VT* 31 (1981), pp. 223–24; A. Caubet, F. Poplin, '"Behemoth, Like You, Job, My Creature!"', *MDB* 48 (1987), p. 22. But see B. Couroyer, 'Behemoth = Hippopotame ou Buffle?', *RB* 94 (1987), pp. 214–21; A. Caquot, 'Le Léviathan de Job 40,25–41,26', *RB* 99 (1992), pp. 40–69. These creatures are frequently supposed to represent the forces of evil; see about this aspect below.

[10] Scholars have often observed this peculiarity, and have dealt with it in three ways. Some try to play it down and do not attach a structural conclusion to this phenomenon; so Weiser, Kroeze (note p. 454), Andersen, Keel (p. 43 n. 129: 'Selbstlob in der 1. Person'). Others deduce from this that 41,4–26 is a later expansion of the description of the Leviathan; so Budde, Ruprecht (*art. cit.*, p. 224), Westermann (1978, pp. 121–22), and cf. also Driver-Gray (I, p. 353), Fohrer (p. 528), De Wilde (p. 12) and Van Oorschot (1987, pp. 162–64). Finally, scholars have often 'adjusted' the lines of 41,2–3 'to their context' (see anal. 8.1). Kubina takes 40,32–41,4 as some kind of pivotal section ('Drehpunkt') within the framework of 40,7–41,26 (1979, p. 42).

Starting from this division, a first reading shows that canto I (40,7–14) distinguishes itself from the following cantos, because every line of this opening unit explicitly addresses Job. Canto III (41,4–26) distinguishes itself as a relatively independent unit, because it is entirely devoted to a description of the body of Behemoth/Leviathan. And unlike the preceding cantos Job is not addressed anywhere in this section.[12] The beginning of this canto is indicated by its first words *l' 'ḥryš* ('I will not be silent'). The end of canto II, then, is marked by a reference to the vital point being made, namely the function of the animal description: if facing Leviathan is terrifying, who then can imagine to stand in a contest with God? (41,1–3). The beginning of this canto is marked by the only tricolon which turns up in the poem, 40,15.

A more in-depth rhetorical analysis reveals that the successive cantos constitute an all-embracing, linear parallelism. In this framework canto I is to be taken as the end of an 'incomplete canto'. This linear parallelism is clearly indicated by the verbal repetitions (responsions) which occur in the second parts of the cantos; note especially the words in anal. 8.4.5 which mark the very end of the cantos: *'m*, *gbh* ('to be high'), *r'h* ('to see'), *kl* ('all'), *'pr* ('dust'), *gm* ('also'), *hw'* ('he'). Analysis 8.4.5 further makes it clear, that this aspect of the linear parallelism between the cantos is not confined to the end of these units, but embraces the bodies of the cantos in their entirety (see especially *'pyqym* and *sbb*). The cluster of responsions at the end of the cantos is the most unequivocal and objective proof, I think, that God's second reply to Job constitutes one large poem, the integrity of which cannot be doubted.[13] The formal parallelism between the cantos is substantiated by a thematic approach; cf. anal. 8.2. From this perspective the framework of the cantos and the canticles interlock. In canto I (40,7–14) God summons Job to engage Him and the proud wicked in battle. The theme of fighting now recurs at regular intervals in the poem. The two animals Behemoth and Leviathan divide canto II (40,25-41,3) into two identical cantos (see further below). The theme of fighting most explicitly recurs at the end of canticle II.2 (41,1–3; no one can hold out when he engages God in battle).[14] And note the noun *mlḥmh* ('war') in 40,32b. The canticle as a whole is almost exclusively devoted to the related idea of 'capturing' (a Leviathan). Canto III falls into three almost identical canticles (see below). In canticle III.3, finally, we again meet the theme of battle and fighting; see 41,18–21 (no weapon can overpower the animal; cf. also 41,5–6). This linear parallelism is reinforced by a thematic comparison between canticles II.1 and III.1–2. Canticle II.1 pays attention to the body of Behemoth (see 40,17–18). Similarly canticles III.1–2 (41,4–17) are almost entirely devoted to a description of animal bodies.

---

[11] Cf. Van Selms, p. 209. This scholar wonders whether the poem originally perhaps divided into two main sections with 22 lines each; this would be so, namely, if the unit of 41,10–21 should belong with the description of Behemoth.

[12] About this aspect of the poem see further below, about the structure of canto II.

[13] Cf. Köster with reference to his strophic division: 'Schon dieser strophischen Symmetrie wegen, kann unser Stück schwerlich für unächt angesehn werden' (p. 91 and cf. anal. 8.5), and against Van Oorschot, p. 169. From this point of departure exegesis may not rest before a satisfactory interpretation is found for 40,7–41,26 as a whole, which does justice to its position in the book of Job. My own analysis is meant as a contribution to achieve this end.

Canto II divides into two identical canticles of eleven lines, 40,15–24 and 40,25–41,3. Canticle II.1 deals with the animal 'Behemoth', and canticle II.2 with the animal 'Leviathan'. At the beginning of these canticles God explicitly addresses Job (see 40,15–16 and 25–32). The canticles are rounded off by a challenge to man in general (see 40,24 and 41,1–3). This canticle division is supported by quite a few responsions; note *'mk* ('with you'), *r'š* ('head'), *ḥbr* ('fellow'), *śḥq* ('to laugh'), *hn* ('behold') in anal. 8.4.4. See about the identical strophic structure of the canticles below. Apart from this *linear* parallelism between canticles II.1 and II.2, we can observe some concentric phenomena, which characterize canto II as a relatively self-contained unit. In the first line and in the last lines of canto II (40,15 and 41,2b–3 resp.) God speaks about himself in the first person—inclusio. The canticles are connected with each other by the device of concatenatio; see *lqḥ*, ('to take'), *nqb* ('to pierce') and *'p* ('nose') in anal. 8.4.4.[15] This device is reinforced by the fact that the final line of canticle II.1 introduces the theme of capturing (v. 24), which idea is subsequently developed in the following canticle II.2—thematic extension.[16]

Canto III divides into three almost identical canticles, with a rising series of lines, 41,4–9, 10–17, 18–26 ($6 > 8 > 9$).[17] The demarcation of these canticles is based on the alternation of motifs within the canticles themselves; cf. anal. 8.2. Here, the structure of the canticles and the strophes interlock (see about the strophes below). Canticles III.1 and III.2 open with a description of the inner parts of Leviathan and Behemoth resp. Canticles III.1–3 wind up with a description that focuses on the outward appearance of these animals. Next, the final lines of III.1 (41,7–9) deal with the animal's back and the 'final' lines of III.3 (41,22–24) with the animal's belly. This 'antithetic' correspondence reinforces the semantic parallelism between the canticles in canto III. The canto ties in with the end of canto II, because in 41,4 God speaks about himself in the first person, as in 41,2–3 (cf. above). And the interrogative pronoun *my* ('who?') in 41,5–6 addresses man in general, as do the final lines of canto II (41,1–3); note also *my* and *pnym* in anal. 8.4.5.[18]

---

[14] *ytyṣb* in 41,2b has a hostile meaning; see Kroeze and Kubina (p. 95 n. 146). The same is true for *hqdym* in v. 3a (see Amos 9,10).

[15] It is unwise, I think, to interpret these repetitions as 'sekundäre Verklammerung' and to eliminate 40,24 from its context; against Van Oorschot, p. 84. The line forms an indispensable building block in the rhetorical structure of the poem.

[16] It may also be noted that vv. 24 and 25 are not preceded by the interrogative pronoun/particle *my*/*h-* (cf. 41,2–6 and 40,26–29); about v. 24 see anal. 8.1 above.

[17] Cf. Van Selms in anal. 8.5.

The first three lines of canto I (40,7–9) clearly distinguish themselves as a separate strophe from vv. 10–14; see especially analyses 8.2 and 8.4.3.[19] Vv. 10–12, probably, also represent a strophe of three lines; see anal. 8.4.2 and cf. the strophic structure of the end of the poem (41,22–26; 3.2). The main body of the poem primarily consists of *four*-line strophes. See for the framework on this level especially anal. 8.2. The first line of canto II introduces two motifs: the sight of Behemoth (v. 15a); and Behemoth as a harmless creature (v. 15b–c). These themes are subsequently developed in the following strophes; see vv. 16–18 (sight) and 19–22 (harmless creature).[20] The second canto furthermore contains two strophes of *three* lines, 40,23–24 (cf. anal. 8.1) and 41,1–3. The beginning of these strophes is explicitly indicated by the transition marker *hn* ('behold'); see anal. 8.3.1.1 (note the device of 'anaphora' at the level of the canticles). These three-line strophes demarcate the end of canticles II.1 and II.2. The inner framework of the canticles in canto III is primarily based on the alternation of the motifs *inside* and *outside* (see anal. 8.2 and cf. above, about the canticle structure of this canto). The first canticle of canto III consists of two three-line strophes, 41,4–6 and 7–9. The canto(/poem) is rounded off by a three-

---

[18] For this aspect cf. also Kubina (pp. 41–42) and Van Oorschot (pp. 162–63). Van Oorschot also points out that the frightening sight of the animal in 41,1 already refers to the description of the animal body in 41,5–26. Therefore, according to Van Oorschot, 41,1–4 has a 'Brückenfunktion' (p. 162).

[19] So also Köster, Stickel, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Terrien; see anal. 8.5.

[20] We are dealing here with a normal, poetic device in Hebrew poetry (see the preceding analyses and cf. for a different approach Habel, p. 558); against the imputations of the integrity of especially vv. 19–20 by Westermann (p. 119), Keel (pp. 38–39) and Van Oorschot (pp. 159–60). From a formal perspective vv. 19–20 are firmly embedded in the context; see *r'š*, *ḥbr* and *śḥq* in anal. 8.4.4. It is evidence of unsound logic, I think, when critics first eliminate all the crucial elements from canticle II.1 (such as *'šr 'śyty 'mk* in v. 15b, and vv. 19–20 and 24) and next state that the section about Behemoth lacks every indication to make it fit in God's second reply to Job (against Westermann and Van Oorschot, p. 161).

and a two-line strophe, vv. 22–24 and 25–26.[21]

The rhetorical structure of 40,7–41,26 indicates that the *quintessential thought* of the poem is to be found at the end of the cantos. As noted above, the idea of *battle and fighting* forms the recurrent theme in these sections. God summons his servant Job to join battle with his adversaries. These adversaries are primarily God himself (40,7–9; cf. 41,1–3)[22] and the 'wicked' (40,10–12; cf. 41,18–21).[23] So, especially canto I reveals the main thought of the poem. Thus, the poem (/God's reply) as a whole does not wind up with an overwhelming, final chord. As has been noted previously, the leading idea in a Hebrew poem is not always found at its end (cf. above, anal. 5.6 n. 13). In the context of the extensive reply by God (chs. 38–41) the quintessential thought of the second speech is most explicitly formulated just at the beginning of the poem (40,7–14). The succeeding cantos are just an echo of this opening unit.[24] Considering this fact it is understandable that some scholars take 40,15–41,26 as a later addition. Nevertheless, as pointed out above, the poem as a whole shows a very close-knit, rhetorical structure. And within this framework, even canto III (41,4–26) is surely not to be taken as a later, secondary addition, but must be seen as a coda, which forms a genuine building block in God's second speech (cf. Kubina, p. 98).

My analysis does not support the idea that Behemoth and Leviathan are introduced here as creatures with a *hostile* attitude. This interpretation seems to have quite a few advocates presently (Westermann, Pope, Ruprecht, Keel, Kubina, Habel).[25] However, there is no indication in the poem itself that these animals represent symbols of evil here. They are portrayed in a rather positive way, as creatures beyond compare. One gets the impression that Behemoth and Leviathan are 'depotenzierte Chaoswesen' (Van Oorschot, p. 170, with reference to the Leviathan in Ps. 104,26). God is even proud of his creatures; see 40,15.19 41,4.25–26.[26] The poet only emphasizes the power of these animals to illustrate Job's weakness.[27] Job cannot defeat God's mighty creatures Behemoth and Leviathan. Then, he is surely not able to make an end to the evil forces in the cosmos (40,10–12). How does Job imagine he can stand in a contest with God? (40,7–9).[28]

---

[21] For the strophic structure of canto III see also Köster (!), Stickel, Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Wright, Ley, Webster, Habel; and cf. Hontheim in anal. 8.5. For the strophes 41,22–24 and 25–26 see esp. Köster, Peters, Terrien and Habel.

[22] The pivot line of the strophe 40,7–9 formulates the principal idea; note the roots *špṭ*, *rš'* and *ṣdq* in v. 8. The line deals with God's righteousness against the righteousness of Job. The cluster of transition markers in this pivotal line (see anal. 8.3.3) also characterizes v. 8 as a key verse.

[23] Van Oorschot aptly points out that the portrayal of the frightening, invincible power of the animal in 41,5–26 is meant to make clear Job's weakness. 'Damit wird eine Anbindung des Textes an 40,2.8–14, mit der darin begegnenden Frage nach Hiobs Macht im Vergleich mit der Gottes möglich' (Van Oorschot, p. 168). The connection between the power of God and the powerlessness of Job is clearly suggested by the linear parallelism between the cantos. In view of this framework Van Oorschot's objection to 41,5–26 as an original piece of the poem expires, namely that it is left to the reader 'von der Ohnmacht Hiobs gegenüber dem Leviathan auf dessen Ohnmacht gegenüber Gott zu schließen' (p. 168).

[24] Cf. Skehan: 'the theme could be pursued indefinitely' (1971, p. 123); but see Andersen ('a terrific climax', p. 291).

[25] See also J.G. Gammie, 'Behemoth and Leviathan: On the Didactic and Theological Significance of Job 40,15–41,26', in J.G. Gammie et al. (eds.) *Israelite Wisdom. In*

It becomes evident now that the introductory strophe to God's first reply (38,2–3) already alludes to the different themes which are subsequently developed in the succeeding, two speeches. The first line of this strophe introduces the theme of God's *'ṣh*. The first speech by God (chs. 38–39), then, elaborates this idea of God's plan, according to which the cosmos is constructed. This 'design' is especially to be found in God's providential care for his creatures. The second line of 38,2–3 introduces the idea of a battle between Job and God. This line deliberately opens the second speech by God (40,7–41,26) and constitutes the theme of the poem as a whole![29]

Honour of Samuel Terrien, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978, pp. 217–31; B. Lang, 'Job XL 18 and the "bones of Seth"', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 360–61; H. Rowold, '*my hw'? ly hw'!* Leviathan and Job in Job 41,2-3', *JBL* 105 (1986), pp. 104–09; D. Wolfers, 'The Lord's second speech in the book of Job', *VT* 40 (1990), pp. 474–99.

[26] So P.J. Nel, 'Cosmos and chaos: a reappraisal of the divine discourses in the book of Job', *OTE* 4 (1991), pp. 206–26 (esp. pp. 220–22). But cf. already Hartley on 41,4 ('Proud of his creature ...').

[27] Schlottmann, p. 490; against Gammie and Habel. Van Oorschot rightly notes that the rhetorical questions in God's second reply require the negative answer: 'not I', 'nobody'; whereas the answer to the rhetorical questions in chs. 38–39 is: 'not I, but You!' (Van Oorschot, p. 165). That is to say, there is no hostile relationship between God and his animals Behemoth and Leviathan; against Westermann (p. 123).

[28] Habel rightly notes that Job is God's 'real adversary' (p. 561). As already stated God positively puts an end to the power of the wicked (cf. 38,12–15). In this way God affirms his just administration of the universe and in the human sphere (cf. 40,7–9); and therefore *He must be praised* (cf. 40,14).

[29] Cf. Möller (p. 78) and Hartley: 'The first speech counters Job's accusation that Yahweh fails to administer the world justly, and the second speech challenges Job to surrender his case before the all-powerful ruler of the cosmos' (pp. 32–33). This overall design speaks against the view advocated by Westermann (pp. 118–19.122–23) and Kubina (pp. 122–23) that the second reply is a portrayal of God as 'Herr der Geschichte'. For the relationship between God's first and second reply see also *r'm* in 40,9 and 39,19.25, *hwd* in 40,10 and 39,20, *'bd* in 40,28 and 39,9, *'ymh* in 41,6 and 39,20, *ḥwtm* in 41,7 and 38,14. These formal links speak against Keel's view that 40,9 on formal grounds is to be taken as a gloss (Keel, p. 126–27); note *r'm* in 40,9 and 39,19.25 and see also anal. 8.4.2.

9 Job’s final reaction: Job 42,2–6

Structure: 3.3

[2] *yd‘ty ky kl twkl*   *wl’ ybṣr mmk mzmh*
[3] *my zh m‘lym ‘ṣh*   *bly d‘t*
lkn *hgdty wl’ ’byn*   *npl’wt mmny wl’ ’d‘*

[4] *šm‘ n’ w’nky ’dbr*   *’š’lk whwdy‘ny*
[5] *lšm‘ ’zn šm‘tyk*   *w‘th ‘yny r’tk*
[6] **‘l kn** *’m’s wnḥmty*   *‘l ‘pr w’pr*

9.1 Text

V. 2a—*yd‘ty*: ‘I know’; so Q. K *yd‘t* (‘you know’).

V. 3a–b: cf. for the colometric division 38,2. Maybe a word is lost in the second colon; see BHS.

V. 6b—*‘l*: MT vocalizes as a preposition. I follow Wolters and read the noun ‘child’ (see Gen. 18,27 Job 30,19; cf. also Job 24,9b); A. Wolters, ‘“A Child of Dust and Ashes” (Job 42,6b)’, *ZAW* 102 (1990), pp. 116–19 (cf. NJPS and De Wilde).

9.2 Content

Job’s submission.

I admit my lack of insight in Your superior power and primeordial design of all things (vv. 2–3).

After my encounter with You I submit (vv. 4–5).

9.3 Transition markers

9.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

9.3.1.1 imperative: *šm‘*, v. 4a
n’, v. 4a
imperative: *hwdy‘*, v. 4b

9.3.1.2 *’nky*, v. 4a

9.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

9.3.2.1 no remarks

9.3.2.2 *lkn*, v. v. 3c

9.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

my, v. 3a
zh, v. 3a
'th, v. 5b

9.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

9.4.1 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *yd'*, vv. 2a.3b.3d; see also *byn* in v. 3c
wl', vv. 2b.3c+d—inclusio; see also *bly* in v. 3b
mn, vv. 2b.3d—inclusio
mzmh/ 'ṣh, vv. 2b and 3a resp.
vv. 4–6: *šm'*, vv. 4a.5a (2×)!
w- // w-, vv. 4.6—inclusio

9.4.2 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–3.4–6: *-k*, vv. 2b.5a+b!
yd', vv. 3d.4b—concatenatio
lkn/ 'l kn, vv. 3c and 6a resp.—exacly linear (Habel, p. 579)
w- // w-, vv. 3c–d.4 (concatenatio)
npl'wt/ 'l 'pr w'pr, vv. 3d and 6b resp. (alliter.)—linear

9.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...|2–3.4–6; cf. Bezuidenhout (1986) and Hartley (1988)
Stickel (1842): 2–6 (5)
Schlottmann (1851): no division; similarly Dillmann (1891), König (1926), Kissane (1939), TOB (1978)
Ewald (1854): 40,7–14.42,2–6
Merx (1871): ...|2–3*.5–6 (...|4.4)
Delitzsch (1876): ...|2–3.4–6 (...|6.6)
Wright (1883): ...|2–3.4–6 (...|5.6)
Bickell (1894): 40,4–5.42,2+3c–d.5–6; similarly Duhm (1897), Hölscher (1952), Fohrer (1963), De Wilde (1981); cf. Merx (1871)
Ley (1895): 2–3.4–6 (3.3)
Vetter (1897): 2+3c–d+5–6; similarly NAB (1970)
Hontheim (1904): 40,2+4–5.7–9|10–14|2–3.4–6 (3.3|5|3.3)
Schlögl (1916): 2+3c–d+5–6 (8); cf. Vetter (1897)
Löhr (1918): 40,4–5.42,2–3b.3c–4.5–6 (4×2); cf. Terrien (1963)

Peters (1928): 2–3.5–6 (2.2)
Möller (1955), p. 78: 2|3.4–6, or 2|3.4–5.6
Habel (1985): 2.3a–b.3c–d|4.5.6 (a.b.c|b'.a'.c')

9.6 Comments and summary

Strangely enough, the strophic division of this brief poem cannot univocally be determined. The division into two 3-line strophes (vv. 2–3, 4–6)[1] is primarily supported by thematic considerations; see anal. 9.2. Apart from the proportional distribution of the lines (3 + 3 lines) this little poem seems to defy most formal devices which commonly frame a Hebrew poem. From the perspective of the transition markers there is a relatively large number of contrary indications (see anal. 9.3.3). And the verbal repetitions do not display a distinct pattern either; note anal. 9.4.2.

But also from a thematic perspective there are some uncertainties. Vv. 3a–b and 4 are often taken as quotations from the speeches by God; cf. v. 3a–b with 38,2, and v. 4 with 38,3b and 40,7b.[2] The lines in question probably function as an indication that Job agrees with the speeches from the whirlwind. There is no compelling reason to delete these lines as later additions as some critics are inclined to do (see Bickell and Vetter in anal. 9.5); note the use of unmarked quotations at crucial stages in the preceding speech-cycles, chs. 12,7–12 21,16.19–20.22 24,1–12. However, in 42,2–6 the quotations supposed do not systematically occur at the beginning of the strophes; they are found at different positions, in the middle and the first line resp. (see also Habel in anal. 9.5).

V. 6, finally, is often maintained to be the climactic verse of our book. However, beginning with an article by Patrick[3] there has recently been much discussion about the exact meaning of the line. Contrary to earlier opinions it is now 'widely argued that Job was defiant to the end'.[4] According to Daily the verse 'maintains the denunciation of cosmic mismanagement which would be consistent with Job's sapiential integrity, yet attests to the epistemological transformation effected in him as a result of his encounter with the God of the storm'.[5]

---

[1] So also Ley; cf. Köster, Delitzsch, Wright, Habel in anal. 9.5.

[2] So NBG, RSV, Andersen, Gordis, Kubina, Habel.

[3] D. Patrick, 'The Translation of Job XLII 6', *VT* 26 (1976), pp. 369–71.

[4] A. Wolters, *ZAW* 102 (1990), pp. 116. The discussion concentrates on the meaning of the roots *m's*, *nḥm* and the word *'l*. Cf. E. Noort, *Een duister duel. Over de theologie van het boek Job* (Kamper Cahiers, 59), Kampen: Kok, 1986, pp. 50-1.

[5] Th.F. Daily, 'And Yet He Repents—On Job 42,6', *ZAW* 105 (1993), p. 209.

PART V

The Elihu-Speeches (Job 32–37)

- for further study -

1 Elihu’s first reply to Job (1): Job 32

Structure: 9.9 > 3.3.3|3.3.3 (a.b.c|c’.b’.a’)

I	[6] *ṣ‘yr ’ny lymym*	*w’tm yšyšym*	
	‘l kn zḥlty w’yr’	**mḥwt d‘y** *’tkm*	
	[7] **’mrty** *ymym YDBRW*	*wrb šnym ydy‘w* **ḥkmh**	
	[8] *’kn RWḤ hy’ b’nwš*	*wnšmt šdy* **tbyn***m*	
	[9] *l’ rbym* **yḥkmw**	*wzqnym* **ybynw** *mšpṭ*	
	[10] *lkn* **’mrty** *šm‘h ly*	*’ḤWH D‘Y ’P ’NY*	
	[11] *hn HWḤLTY lDBRYkm*	*’zyn ‘d* **tbwnty***km*	*‘d tḥqrwn MLYN*
	[12] *w‘dykm* **’tbwnn**	*whnh ’yn l’ywb mwkyḥ*	*‘wnh ’MRYw mkm*
	[13] *pn* **t’mrw** *mṣ’nw* **ḥkmh**	*’l ydpnw l’ ’yš*	

II	[14] *wl’ ‘rk ’ly MLYN*	*wb’MRYkm l’ ’šybnw*
	[15] *ḥtw l’ ‘nw ‘wd*	*h‘tyqw mhm* **mlym**
	[16] *wHWḤLTY* **ky l’** *YDBRW*	**ky** *‘mdw* **l’** *‘nw ‘wd*
	[17] **’‘nh** *’P ’NY ḥlqy*	*’ḤWH D‘Y ’P ’NY*
	[18] **ky** *mlty* **mlym**	*hṣyqtny RWḤ bṭny*
	[19] *hnh bṭny kyyn* **l’** *ypth̩*	*k’bwt ḥdšym ybq‘*

[20] *’DBRH wyrwḥ ly*   *’ptḥ śpty w’*‘**nh**
[21] *’l n’ ’ś’ pny ’yš*   *w’l ’dm l’ ’knh*
[22] **ky l’** *yd‘ty ’knh*   *km‘ṭ yś’ny ‘śny*

1.1 Text

V. 10—*šm‘h*: the singular indicates that Elihu addresses Job in the second strophe.

Vv. 11–12: two tricola; so MT. Most critics take these verses as three bicola; the strophic structure of the poem, however, supports MT.

1.2 Content

Elihu introduces himself.

I Elihu has waited patiently—but in vain—until the other friends would have refuted Job with their wisdom.
  Because I am still a young man I have hesitated to speak (vv. 6–7).
  Wisdom, however, is granted to a man by the *spirit* of God and is not obtained on the ground of age; therefore, I consider myself qualified to join in the debate (vv. 8–10).
  I have listened to you attentively, but none of you could refute Job (vv. 11–13).

II But now that the friends have nothing to say for themselves, Elihu is not able to restrain himself any longer.
  They have been defeated, and will not answer Job anymore (vv. 14–16).
  I must join in the debate because the *spirit* in my belly constrains me (vv. 17–19).
  It will be a relief for me to speak my mind; with my speech I will flatter nobody (vv. 20–22).

1.3 Transition markers

1.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

1.3.1.1 *’ny*, v. 6a
’tm, v. 6b
’kn, v. 8a
’nwš, v. 8a
hn, v. 11a; ext. // with *hnh* in v. 12b
w- beginning line, v. 14a
’ny, v. 17a
’ny, v. 17b
cohortative: *’dbrh*, v. 20

1.3.1.2 *hy’*, v. 8a
’p, v. 17a
’p, v. 17b

1.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

1.3.2.1 *’mr*, v. 7a
’mr, v. 10a
’p, v. 10b
’mr, v. 13a

1.3.2.2 *lkn*, v. 10a
imper. energ.: *šm‘h*, v. 10a
’ny, v. 10b
w- beginning line, v. 16a
hnh, v. 19a

1.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

w- beginning line, v. 12a
’l (prohib.), v. 21a
n’, v. 21a

1.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

1.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’yš*, vv. 13, 21; *’l* (prep.). vv. 14, 21 (cf. *’l* [‘God’] in v. 13 and *’l* [prohib.] in v. 21); *’mr*, vv. 7, 10, 12, 13, 14; *’ny*, vv. 6, 10, 17, 17; *’p*, vv. 10, 17, 17
b: *bṭn*, vv. 18, 19; *byn*, vv. 8, 9, 11, 12
d: *dbr*, vv. 7, 11, 16, 20
h: *hnh*, vv. 11 (*hn*), 12, 19
ḥ: *ḥwh*, vv. 6, 10, 17; *ḥkm*, vv. 7, 9, 13
y: *-y*, vv. 6, 10, 10, 17, 17, 18, 19, 20, 20 (cf. *-ny* too); *yd‘*, vv. 6, 7, 10, 17, 22; *ywm*, vv. 6, 7; *yḥl*, vv. 11, 16
k: *k-*, vv. 19, 19, 22; *ky*, vv. 16, 16, 18, 22; *-km*, vv. 6, 11, 11, 12, 12, 14; *kn*, vv. 6, 10; *knh*, vv. 21, 22
l: *l-*, vv. 6, 10, 10, 11, 12, 20; *l’*, vv. 9, 13, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16, 19, 21, 22
m: *mlh*, vv. 11, 14, 15, 18; *mn*, vv. 6, 12, 15
n: *-nw* (suffix 3 sing.), vv. 13, 14; *-ny*, vv. 18, 22, 22, (cf. *-y* too); *nś’*, vv. 21, 22
‘: *‘d*, vv. 11, 11, 12; *‘wd*, vv. 15, 16; *‘nh*, vv. 12, 15, 16, 17, 20
p: *ptḥ*, vv. 19, 20
r: *rbb*, vv. 7, 9; *rwḥ*, vv. 8, 18, 20

1.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 6–7: *ymym*, vv. 6a.7a!—inclusio
yd‘, vv. 6d.7b
vv. 8–10: *’kn/lkn*, vv. 8a and 10a resp.—inclusio
byn, vv. 8b.9b

vv. 11–13: *hnh/hn*, vv. 11a and 12b respectively
-km, vv. 11a+b.12a+c
‘d, vv. 11b+c.12a!
byn, vv. 11b.12a; note *tbwnt* and *’tbwnn* resp.—alliteration
’mr, vv. 12c.13a
vv. 14–16: *l’*, vv. 14a+b.15a.16a+b
mlyn/m, vv. 14a.15b—last word of the colon
(*l’*) *‘nw ‘wd*, vv. 15a.16b!—second part of the colon
vv. 17–19: *-y*, vv. 17a+b.18b.19a
bṭn(*y*), vv. 18b.19a!
vv. 20–22: *nś’*, vv. 21a.22b!
l’, vv. 21b.22a
’knh, vv. 21b.22a!

1.4.3 Within the cantos

vv. 6–13 (canto I): *’l kn . . . mḥwt d‘y/lkn . . . ’ḥwh d‘y*, vv. 6c–d and 10 resp.!; see also *ydy‘w* in v. 7b
’mr, vv. 7a.10a.13a—linear; note *’mrty* in vv. 7a and 10a; see also v. 12c
dbr, vv. 7a.11a—symmetric
ḥkm, vv. 7b.9a.13a!; note *ḥkmh* in vv. 7b and 13a—linear
rb, vv. 7b.9a!
byn, vv. 8b+9b.11b+12a!—linear

vv. 14–22 (canto II): *l’*, vv. 14–16.19a.21b+22a
’l (prep.), vv. 14a.21b!; see also *’l* (prohib.) in v. 21a
mlym, vv. 15b.18a—linear; see also *mlyn* in v. 14a
ky, vv. 16a+b.18a.22a!; note *ky* (. . .) *l’* in vv. 16a+b and 22a—linear
dbr, vv. 16a.20a—symmetric
’‘nh, vv. 17a.20b!—linear; see also *‘nw* in vv. 15a and 16b
-y, vv. 17a+b.20a+b—‘exactly linear’; see also vv. 18b and 19a
yd‘, vv. 17b.22a
-ny, vv. 18b.22b (2×)!
rwḥ, vv. 18b.20a
ptḥ, vv. 19a.20b!—concatenatio
k-, vv. 19a+b.22b!—linear

1.4.4 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

The symmetric arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 6–10.17–22: *-y*, vv. 6d+10a+b.17a+b+18a+19a+20a+b!
dbr, vv. 7a.20a—exactly symmetric
rwḥ (‘spirit’), vv. 8a.18b!—second and second last strophe respectively; see also v. 20a!
-y, vv. 10a.17a+b+18a+19a
’ḥwh d‘y ’p ’ny, vv. 10b.17b!—exactly symmetric; see also *yd‘* in vv. 6d+7b and 22a!, and *’p ’ny* in v. 17a!

vv. 11–13.14–16: *hwḥlty*, vv. 11a.16a!—exactly symmetric
dbr, vv. 11a.16a—exactly symmetric
-km, vv. 11a+b+12a+c.14b
mlyn, vv. 11c.14a; see also *mlym* in v. 15b
‘nh, vv. 12c.15a+16b
mn, vv. 12c.15b—exactly symmetric
’mry, vv. 12c.14b; see also *’mr* in v. 13a
’l (‘God’)/*’l* (prep.), vv. 13b and 14a resp.—concat.
-nw (3 singular), vv. 13b.14b!—concatenatio
l’ ’yš/l’ ’šybnw, vv. 13b and 14b resp. (alliter.) —concatenatio

The linear arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 6–7.14–16: *mn*, vv. 6d.15b
-km, vv. 6d.14b
ydbrw, vv. 7a.16a!—exactly linear

vv. 8–10.17–19: see above

vv. 11–13.20–22: *’l ydpnw … ’yš/ ’l … pny ’yš*, vv. 13b and 21a resp.! (alliteration)

1.4.5 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

1.4.5.1 Partially left out of consideration
’ny (v. 6), *hnh* (v. 19), *-km* (v. 6), *l’* (v. 9), *mn* (v. 6)

1.4.5.2 Totally left out of consideration
l-

1.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 6–10.11–14.15–18.19–22|… (5.4.4.4|…)
Stickel (1842): 6–10.11–14.15–17|18–22… (5.4.3|5…)
Schlottmann (1851): 6–7.8–9.10|11–12.13–14||15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22||… (2.2.1|2.2||2.2.2.2||…)
Delitzsch (1876): 6–7.8–10.11–14.15–17.18–22|… (5.6.10.6.10|…)
Wright (1883): 6–7.8–10.11–14|15–17.18–20.21–33,3|… (6.6.10|6.6.10|…)
Dillmann (1891): 6–10.11–14.15–22…
Bickell (1894): 6.7–8.9–10.11+13.14+18.19–20.21–22…
Ley (1895): 6–10.11–14.15–18.19–22; cf. Köster (1831)
Duhm (1897): 6.7–8.9+15.16–17.11a–b+12a+11c.12b–13.14+18.19–20. 21–22; similarly Hölscher (1952) and De Wilde (1981)
Vetter (1897): 6–7.8–10|11–12.13–14.15–16|17–18.19–20|21–22|…
Hontheim (1904): 6–7.8–10|11–14|15–17.18–20|21–33,3|… (3.3|5|3.3|5|…); cf. Wright (1883)
Schlögl (1916): 6–14|15–22 (22.16); cf. Epping-Nelis (1968)
Peters (1928): 6–7.8–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22 (3×3.5×2)
König (1929): 6–10.11–14.15–22; similarly RSV (1952), TOB (1978), Rozelaar (1984); cf. Dillmann (1891)
Kissane (1939): 6–7.8–10.11–12.13+33,4+32,14.15–17.18–20.33,3+32,21–22 (7×3)
Möller (1955): 6.7–14 (=7–10.11–14).15–22 (1.8.8)
Fohrer (1963): 6–10.11–14.15–22 (6.5.8); cf. König (1929)
Terrien (1963): 6–7.8–10|11–12.13–14|15–17.18–22
Skehan (1969): 6|7–10|11–12a.12b–14.15–16|17–20|21–22 (2|4|2.3.2|4|2)
NAB (1970): 6–10.11–14.15–17.18–22; cf. Stickel (1842)
Van Selms (1983): 6–12.13–17.18–22…
Webster (1984), pp. 100–01: 6–7.8–10.11–14.15–17.18–20.21–22
Habel (1985): 6.7–9.10|11–12a.12b–15.16|17.18–21.22 (a.b.c|a'.b'.a''|c'.b''.a''')
MacKenzie (1990): 6–10.11–14|15–17.18–22 (5.5|3.5)
Wahl (1993): 6–10.11–16.17–22

1.6 Comments and summary: the bifocal structure of ch. 32

In the past century some scholars assumed that the Elihu-speeches distinguish themselves from their context because, among other things, they do not display a strophic structure of some sort. Ewald (1854) refrained here from any structural division, while in the other poetic parts of Job he continually tried to show a certain strophic pattern; so also Hitzig (1874), and cf. Ball (1922) and KBS (1980). Ley (1895) divided the Elihu-speeches into smaller units. He states, however: 'Der regelmässige Strophenbau wird … durchaus vermißt' (p. 678). Vetter (1897), too, discerned several sections within chs. 32–37. But apart from the last Elihu-speech (chs. 36–37) he was not able anymore to point to 'aeusserliche Merkmale' (formal features) which could support his divisions (p. 50). According to Dillmann (1891), then, the Elihu-speeches do not exhibit the same high poetic level as the other poems. 'Hier redet ein minder grossen Dichter …. Auffallend genug zeigt sich dies auch … in der Anlage der Reden: die logische u. dichterische Gliederung entsprechen sich nicht, die Absätze sind sehr ungleichartig'.

These opinions seem to point to an obscurely elaborated literary framework in chs. 32–37. Regarding Job 32, however, modern research has tried to prove quite the contrary. In a brief article Skehan (1969) attempts to demonstrate for this poem a striking concentric structure with strophes of 2, 4, 7, 4 and 2 lines respectively (see anal. 1.5). This structure is supported, according to Skehan, by the recurrent catch phrase *ḥwt d'y* (v. 6d) / *'ḥwh d'y 'p 'ny* (vv. 10b and 17b) and by the including verbal repetitions of *'mrty* (vv. 7a and 10a), *hwḥlty* (vv. 11a and 16a) and *''nh* (vv. 17a and 20b). He concludes that ch. 32 is to be taken as 'a formal rhetorical exercise' (p. 87). Fifteen years later Webster (1984) correctly points out that the verbal repetitions are 'far more extensive' than Skehan suggested. He proposes for this poem an altogether different structure with six strophes. 'Five of the six strophes … have internal inclusions. Each strophe is linked to at least one other strophe by such patterned repetitions as parallel openings and parallel closings' (p. 100). To describe the macrostructure of the poem Webster includes—besides the repetitions noted by Skehan—the roots *dbr* ('to speak'; vv. 7, 11, 16) and *yd'* ('to know'; vv. 7, 22), and the noun *mlym* ('words'; vv. 15, 18); p. 101. However, the concentric pattern of the strophes as advocated by Skehan is now disturbed.

To describe the structural pattern of ch. 32 Habel again uses a concentric framework. His 'design' is even more elaborate than the concentric structure advocated by Skehan. This time a description of motifs and content forms the basis of the analysis. The verbal repetitions pointed out by Skehan and Webster, Habel leaves out of consideration. His design rests on the following correspondences: protestation (v. 6), argumentation (vv. 7–9), announcement of intent (v. 10)—protestation (vv. 11–12a), argumentation (vv. 12b–15), protestation (v. 16)—announcement of intent (v. 17), argumentation (vv. 18–21), protestation (v. 22). This concentric pattern is alleged to show the 'rhetorical force of Elihu's apology for assuming the role of *arbiter and attorney of the Almighty*' (italics are mine, PvdL).[1]

---

[1] According to the analysis by Hontheim (1904) vv. 11–14 form the centre of ch. 32

Habel (and Skehan) made some very fine observations about the symmetric structure of this poem. Sometimes, however, Habel suggests a symmetrical connection between verses which in fact cannot be linked together by motif or idea, e.g., vv. 6 and 22, and vv. 12b–15. And the tripartite division of the poem does no justice to the coherence of vv. 6–7 and 11 (Elihu's patience) and of vv. 9 and 12–13 (the failure of the elders). Furthermore, it overlooks the relationship between vv. 14b and 21–22 (Elihu will not speak like his predecessors); cf. König and Fohrer in anal. 1.5. The analysis by Webster is based on an almost complete overview of the verbal repetitions and related features. However, as is shown by analysis 1.4.1, Webster did not take into account all these repetitions either. He did not note the repetitions of the roots *byn* ('to understand'), *'mr* ('to say'; v. 13) and *ḥkm* ('to be wise'; vv. 6–13), nor the repetitions of *ky* (...) *l'* in vv. 14–22 and the root *dbr* ('to speak'; v. 20), to mention some of the most striking omissions.

Skekan aptly considered whether this poem has 'more words and more structure than the contents would seem to deserve' (p. 87). Probably, no poem in the book of Job contains so many meaningful, namely structuring, verbal repetitions within so confined a space as ch. 32. Therefore, we especially have to look for the formal features which constitute the literary framework of this small composition. When we consider all the verbal repetitions in ch. 32 in correlation with each other the poem appears to display an unbroken series of three-line strophes. See analyses 1.4.2 and 1.4.3; note especially *'mr*, *ḥkm* and *byn* in vv. 6–13, and *ky* (...) *l'*, *''nh* ('I answer') and *k-* in vv. 14–22. The refrain-like repetition *t'mrw* ... *ḥkmh* marks v. 13 as the last line of the third strophe, and not v. 14 as is generally assumed (see anal. 1.5). So, I agree with Kissane that the poem as a whole displays a regular strophic pattern with strophes of three lines. In my opinion, however, it is not necessary to resort to textual emendation to obtain this regularity.

In theory we could arrange the three-line strophes in two ways. They could be joined two by two; this would result into three cantos of six lines, vv. 6–10, 11–16, 17–22 (so Habel and Wahl; cf. Skehan). The numerous verbal repetitions between vv. 11–13 and 14–16 seem to advocate this opinion (see anal. 1.4.4). However, I made objections to such a division on the basis of content (see above). Moreover, there are some formal indications which suggest for this poem a bipartite structure. As already indicated the strophes in vv. 6–13 display a characteristic set of verbal repetitions, different from the repetitions which mark the strophes in vv. 14–22 (see

---

(first 'Mittelstrophe'). The name 'Job' would, then, characterize the central line of this strophe (p. 243).

anal. 1.4.3). This feature divides our poem into two uniform cantos of nine lines each, vv. 6–13 and 14–22. The connecting theme in the first canto is Elihu's attitude of expectation (vv. 6–7 and 11–12a); note the second colon of the opening line: 'you are old men'. The connecting thematic element in the second canto is the way Elihu intends to speak, formulated in the negative (vv. 14b and 21–22); note the second colon of the opening line: 'I will *not reply* him with your statements'.

So, in my opinion, we must allow a main caesura between vv. 13 and 14. By this division the symmetric positioning of the verbal repetitions is even more obvious than in the marking out of sections by Skehan and Habel. I point to *mlyn*, *'mry*, and the suffix *-nw*; see anal. 1.4.4. From this analysis I deduce that the poem as a whole has no focal strophe or canto which formulates its main theme; but see Habel (and Hontheim; cf. also Skehan).

Yet, the poet actually focussed the attention on the main theme of his work of art by a concentric positioning of his ideas. The pivotal idea of his composition, however, is not to be found in the centre of the poem as a whole, but in the central strophes of the individual cantos. A section in which Elihu appeals to the *spirit* (of God) forms the pivotal strophe of each canto; note *rwḥ* ('spirit') in vv. 8a and 18b. So from the perspective of the train of thought, the cantos each for themselves exhibit a pivot pattern. In the first canto Elihu's appeal to inspiration is included by his *hesitation to speak*. In the second canto his appeal to inspiration is included by an indication of *the way he will not speak*.

Formally the root *dbr* ('to speak') supports the twofold concentric structure. This root includes the pivotal strophes of both cantos in a perfectly symmetric way (anal. 1.4.3). This bifocal structure of ch. 32 emphasizes the *leading idea* of Elihu's introductory speech: to justify his *speaking* Elihu prides himself on his *divine inspiration*!

The following outline tries to visualise the framework of ch. 32:

Table I

Canto	Theme	Pos./ neg.	Key words	Motif (cf. Habel)	
I	Why Elihu did not intervene in the discussion (vv. 6–7)	–	*’mr* *DBR* *ḥkm*	argumentation (v. 6a–b) protestation (vv. 6c–7)	a b
	Elihu decides to intervene (vv. 8–10)	+	*RWḤ* *ḥkm* *’mr*	argumentation (vv. 8–9) announcement of intent (v. 10)	a’ c
	Why Elihu did not intervene in the discussion (vv. 11–13)	–	*DBR* *’mr* *ḥkm*	protestation (vv. 11–12) criticism (v. 13)	b’ d
II	Elihu will not speak like his predecessors (vv. 14–16)	–	*ky l’* *DBR*	criticism (v. 14) protestation (vv. 15–16)	d’ b’’
	Elihu has decided to interfere (vv. 17–19)	+	*RWḤ* *ky* *l’*	announcement of intent (v. 17) argumentation (vv. 18–19)	c’ a’’
	Elihu will not flatter anybody (vv. 20–22)	–	*DBR* *ky l’*	announcement of intent (v. 20) protestation (vv. 21–22)	c’’ b’’’

2 Elihu's first reply to Job (2): Job 33

Structure: 7.11.12 3 > 3.4|4.4.3|4.4.4 3 > 3|2.2||2.2|2.2|3||2.2|2.2|2.2 3

I.1	1	*w'wlm ŠM' n' 'YWB MLY*	*wkl dbry H'ZYNH*	
	2	*hnh n' ptḥty py*	*dbrh lšwny bḥky*	
	3	*yšr lby 'mry*	*wd't śpty brwr MLLW*	
I.2	4	*rwḥ 'L 'śtny*	*wnšmt šdy tḥyny*	
	5	*'m twkl hšybny*	*'rkh lpny htyṣbh*	
	6	*HN 'ny kpyk l'L*	*mḥmr qrṣty gm 'ny*	
	7	*hnh 'mty l' tb'tk*	*w'kpy 'lyk l' ykbd*	

II.1	8	*'k 'mrt b'ZNy*	*wqwl MLYN 'ŠM'*	
	9	*zk 'ny bly pš'*	*ḥp 'NKY wl' 'wn ly*	
	10	*hn tnw'wt 'ly ymṣ'*	*yḥšbny l'wyb lw*	
	11	*yśm bsd rgly*	*yšmr kl 'rḥty*	
II.2	12	*hn z't l' ṣdqt ''nk*	*ky yrbh 'LWH m'nwš*	
	13	*mdw' 'lyw rybwt*	*ky kl dbryw l' y'nh*	
	14	*ky b'ḥt ydbr 'l*	*wbštym l' yšwrnh*	
	15	*bḥlwm ḥzywn lylh*	*bnpl trdmh 'l 'nšym*	*btnwmwt 'ly mškb*
II.3	16	*'z yglh* **'zn** *'nšym*	*wbmsrm yḥtm*	
	17	*lhsyr 'dm mm'śh*	*wgwh mGBR yksh*	
	18	*yḥśk NPŠW MNY ŠḤT*	*wḥytw M'BR bšlḥ*	

III.1	19	*whwkḥ bmk'wb 'l mškbw*	*wryb* 'ṢMYW *'tn*	
	20	*wzhmtw* **ḥyt***w lḥm*	*w***npš***w m'kl t'wh*	
	21	*ykl* **bśrw** *mr'y*	*wšpw* 'ṢMWTYW *l' r'w*	
	22	*wtqrb lšḥt* **npš***w*	*w***ḥyt***w lmw mtym*	
III.2	23	*'m yš 'lyw ml'k*	*mlyṣ 'ḥd mny 'lp*	*lhgyd l'dm* **yšrw**
	24	*wyḥnnw* **wy'mr**	*pd'hw mrdt šḥt*	*mṣ'ty kpr*
	25	*rṭpš* **bśrw** *mn'r*	*yšwb lymy 'lwmyw*	
	26	*y'tr 'l 'LWH wyrṣhw*	*wyr' pnyw btrw'h*	*wyšb l'nwš ṣdqtw*

III.3	[27] *yšr ‘l ’nšym* **wy’mr**	*ḥṭ’ty* **wyšr** *h‘wyty*	*wl’ šwh ly*
	[28] *pdh* **npšy** *M‘BR bšḥt*	*w***ḥyt***y* B’WR *tr’h*	
	[29] *HN kl ’lh yp‘l ’L*	*p‘mym šlwš ‘m GBR*	
	[30] *lhšyb NPŠW MNY ŠḤT*	*l’*WR B’WR *h***ḥyym**	

B	[31] *hqšb ’YWB ŠM‘ ly*	*hḥrš w’NKY ’dbr*
	[32] *’m yš MLYN hšybny*	*dbr ky ḥpṣty ṣdqk*
	[33] *’m ’yn ’th ŠM‘ ly*	*hḥrš w’ ’lpk ḥkmh*

2.1 Text

V. 17a—*mm‘śh*: ‘from (his) deed’; MT *m‘śh* (‘deed’)—haplography, cf. BHS.

V. 21b—*wšpw*: ‘and they protrude’; so Q (Habel, Hartley, Wahl; cf. HAL). K *wšpy* (‘and bareness’).

V. 22b—*lmw mtym*: ‘to the dead’ (with many critics; cf. BHS); MT *lmmtym* (‘to killers’).

2.2 Content

Elihu addresses Job.

- I Introduction: Elihu summons Job to listen and to answer.
  - I.1 Job, listen to my sincere words (vv. 1–3).
  - I.2 Summons to respond.
    - If possible, answer my speech (v. 5) and do not be afraid (v. 7);
    - I am a creature just like you (vv. 4 and 6).
- II God speaks to a human being through dreams.
  - II.1 Elihu reproduces Job’s words.
    - I hold on to my innocence (vv. 8–9);
    - but God counts me as his enemy (vv. 10–11).
  - II.2 God speaks to man by means of dreams.
    - It is no use contending with God (vv. 12–13).
    - God indirectly makes himself known through dreams (vv. 14–15).
  - II.3 God’s *purpose* in speaking through dreams: He attempts to save a man’s soul from the grave (vv. 16–18).
- III God speaks to a human being by making him ill.
  - III.1 God also speaks to a man by making him suffer.
    - A man may also be exhorted by pain (vv. 19–20).
    - Then, his soul may even come close to the grave (vv. 21–22).

III.2 God restores to health.
If he could have an angel to vouch for him, he would be redeemed from descending to the grave (vv. 23–24).
Then, he would turn to God and see His face (vv. 25–26).
III.3 God’s *purpose* in speaking through suffering: He attempts to save a man’s soul from the grave.
A man will confess that God redeemed his soul from the grave (vv. 27–28).
God does these things with a person to bring his soul back from the grave (vv. 29–30).
B Summons to Job to hear the wisdom of Elihu and, if possible, to answer (vv. 31–33).

2.3 Transition markers

2.3.1 In the first line of the strophe

2.3.1.1 *w*- beginning line, v. 1a
’wlm, v. 1a
imperative: *šm‘*, v. 1a
n’, v. 1a; ext. // *n’* in v. 2a
vocative: *’ywb*, v. 1a
imper. energ.: *h’zynh*, v. 1b
hn, v. 6a; ext. // *hnh* in v. 7a
’ny, v. 6a
’ny, v. 6b
’k, v. 8a
hn, v. 10a
hn, v. 12a
z’t, v. 12a
’nwš, v. 12b
’z, v. 16a
w- beginning line, v. 19a; ext. // *w*- in v. 20a
hn, v. 29a
’lh, v. 29a
imperative: *hqšb*, v. 31a
vocative: *’ywb*, v. 31a
imperative: *šm‘*, v. 31a
ḥrš, v. 31b
imperative: *hḥrš*, v. 31b

2.3.1.2 *’mr*, v. 8a
’mr, v. 27a
’nky, v. 31b

2.3.2 In the last line of the strophe

2.3.2.1 *’nky*, v. 9a
’mr, v. 24a

2.3.2.2 *w*- beginning line, v. 22a
’th, v. 33a
imperative: *šm‘*, v. 33a; ext. // *hšyb* in v. 32a
ḥrš, v. 33b
imperative: *hḥrš*, v. 33b; ext. // *dbr* in v. 32b

2.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

hnh, v. 2a
imperative: *hšyb*, v. 5a
imper. energ.: *‘rkh*, v. 5b
imper. energ.: *htyṣbh*, v. 5b
gm, v. 6b
’ny, v. 9a
mdw‘, v. 13a
w- beginning line, v. 24a

2.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

2.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

’: *’dm*, vv. 17, 23; *’wr*, vv. 28, 30, 30; *’zn*, vv. 1, 8, 16; *’ḥd*/ *’ḥt*, vv. 23, 14 respectively; *’ywb*, vv. 1, 31; *’l* (prep.), vv. 13, 26; *’l* (God), vv. 4, 6, 14, 29; *’lwh*, vv. 12, 26; *’lp*/ *’lp*, vv. 23, 33; *’m*, vv. 5, 23, 32, 33; *’mr*, vv. 3, 8, 24, 27; *’nwš*, vv. 12, 15, 16, 26, 27; *’ny*, vv. 6, 6, 9; *’nky*, vv. 9, 31

b: *b-*, vv. 2, 8, 11, 14, 14, 15 (3×), 16, 18, 19, 26, 28, 28, 30; *bśr*, vv. 21, 25

g: *gbr*, vv. 17, 29

d: *dbr*, vv. 1, 2, 13, 14, 31, 32

h: *-hw*, vv. 20, 24, 26 (see also *-nw* in v. 24); *hn*, vv. 6, 10, 12, 29; *hnh*, vv. 2, 7

w: *-w*, vv. 10, 13, 13, 18, 18, 19, 19, 20, 20, 21, 21, 22, 22, 23, 23, 25, 25, 26, 26, 30

ḥ: *ḥyh*, vv. 4, 18, 20, 22, 28, 30; *ḥrš*, vv. 31, 33

y: *-y*, vv. 1, 1, 2 (3×), 3 (3×), 5, 7, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 11, 27, 28, 28, 31, 33; *yš*, vv. 23, 32; *yšr*, vv. 3, 23, 27 (2×?)

k: *-k*, vv. 6, 7, 7, 12, 32, 33; *ky*, vv. 12, 13, 14, 32; *kl*, vv. 1, 11, 13, 29

l: *l-*, vv. 5, 6, 9, 10, 10, 17, 22, 23, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 30, 31, 33 (see also *lmw** in v. 22); *l’*, vv. 7, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 21, 27

m: *mll*, vv. 1, 3, 8, 32; *mn*, vv. 6, 12, 17*, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 28; *mny*, vv. 18, 23, 30; *mṣ’*, vv. 10, 24

n: *n’*, vv. 1, 2; *-ny*, vv. 4, 4, 5, 10, 32; *npš*, vv. 18, 20, 22, 28, 30

‘: *‘br*, vv. 18, 28; *‘l*, vv. 7, 10, 15, 19, 23, 27 (see also *‘ly* in v. 15); *‘nh*, vv. 12, 13; *‘ṣm*, vv. 19, 21

p: *ph*, vv. 2, 6; *pnym*, vv. 5, 26

ṣ: *ṣdq*, vv. 12, 26, 32

r: *r’h*, vv. 21, 21, 26, 28; *ryb*, vv. 13, 19 š: *šwb*, vv. 5, 25, 26, 30, 32; *šḥt*, vv. 18, 22, 24, 28, 30; *škb*, vv. 15, 19; *šmʻ*, vv. 1, 8, 31, 33

2.4.2 Within the strophes

vv. 1–3: *n'*, vv. 1a.2a!—linear
mll, vv. 1a.3b—inclusio
dbr, vv. 1b.2b
-y, vv. 1(2×).2(3×).3(3×)
vv. 4–5: *-ny*, vv. 4a.5a—linear ('rime'); see also *-ny* in v. 4b
vv. 6–7: *hn/hnh*, vv. 6a and 7a respectively—exactly linear
-k, vv. 6a.7a+b
kpyk/w'kpy, vv. 6a and 7b resp.—alliteration
vv. 12–13: *l'*, vv. 12a.13b
ʻnh, vv. 12a.13b
ky, vv. 12b.13b—exactly linear
yrbh/rybwt, vv. 12b and 13a resp.—alliteration
vv. 16–18: *mn*, vv. 17a*+b.18b; see also *mny* in v. 18a
vv. 19–20: *w-* beginning line, vv. 19a.20a—exactly linear
vv. 25–26: *šwb*, vv. 25b.26c
vv. 27–28: *-y*, vv. 27c.28a+b
vv. 31–33: *šmʻ ly*, vv. 31a.33a—inclusio
hḥrš w-, vv. 31b.33b!—inclusio
dbr, vv. 31b.32b
'm yš/'m 'yn, vv. 32a and 33a resp.—exactly linear
-k, vv. 32b.33b

2.4.3 Within the canticles

vv. 4–7 (I.2): *'l* (God), vv. 4a.6a—linear; see also *šdy* in v. 4b
vv. 12–15 (II.2): *'nwš*, vv. 12b.15b—inclusio
l', vv. 12a+13b.14b—concatenatio
ky, vv. 12b+13b.14a—concatenatio
dbr, vv. 13b.14a—concatenatio
'lwh/'l, vv. 12b and 14a respectively—linear
vv. 19–22 (III.1): *ʻṣm*, vv. 19b.21b!—linear
w- beginning line, vv. 19a+20a.22a
ḥytw, vv. 20a.22b—linear } chiasm (Lescow, p. 151)
npšw, vv. 20b.22a—linear
vv. 23–26 (III.2): *-hw*, vv. 24b.26a—linear; see also *-nw* (3 sing.) in v. 24a
mn, vv. 24b.25a—concatenatio

vv. 27–30 (III.3): v. 28 linear parallel with v. 30:
npš, vv. 28a.30a
mn/mny, vv. 28a and 30a respectively
šḥt, vv. 28b.30b (exactly linear)
b-, vv. 28a+b.30b
’wr, vv. 28b.30b (2×)!
ḥyh, vv. 28b.30b

2.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 1–7 (canto I): *hnh*, vv. 2a.7a!; see also *hn* in v. 6a
ph, vv. 2a.6a!

vv. 8–18 (canto II): *zkk/ṣdq*, vv. 9a and 12a resp.—linear; cf. Job 8,3+6 15,14–15 16,17+17,9 25,4–5
l’, vv. 9b.12a+13b+14b
‘l, vv. 10a.15b—linear; see also *‘ly* in v. 15c
’zn, vv. 8a.16a—linear
mn, vv. 12b.17–18
’nšym, vv. 15b.16a—concatenatio

vv. 19–30 (canto III): *‘l*, vv. 19a.23a.27a—linear
r’h, vv. 21a+b.26b.28b!
šḥt, vv. 22a.24b.28a+30a—linear
-hw, vv. 20a.24b+26a!; see also *-nw* in v. 24a
bśrw, vv. 21a.25a!—exactly linear
ḥyh, vv. 20a+22b.28b+30b—linear
npš, vv. 20b+22a.28a+30a—linear
l’, vv. 21b.27c
mny, vv. 23b.30a
yšrw/wyšr, vv. 23c and 27b resp.; see also *yšr* in v. 27a
wy’mr, vv. 24a.27a—linear
pd‘hw/pdh, vv. 24b and 28a resp. (alliteration) —linear
šwb, vv. 25b+26c.30a—linear
’lwh/’l, vv. 26b.29a—linear
’nwš, vv. 26c.27a—concatenatio

2.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 1–3.8–11.19–22.31–33: *w-* beginning line, vv. 1a.19a+20a—exactly

linear; see also v. 22a
šm‘, vv. 1a.8b.31a+33a!—linear
’ywb (vocative), vv. 1a.31a!—linear
’ywb/bmk’wb, vv. 1a and 19a resp. (alliter.)—linear; see also *l’wyb lw* in v. 10b
mll, vv. 1a+3b.8b.32a!—linear
dbr, vv. 1b+2b.31b+32b—linear
’zn, vv. 1b.8a—linear
bḥky/whwkḥ bmk’wb, vv. 2b and 19a resp. (alliter.)—linear
’mr, vv. 3a.8a—linear
’nky, vv. 9b.31b!—linear

vv. 12–15.23–26: *ṣdq*, vv. 12a.26c
’lwh, vv. 12b.26a!
’nwš, vv. 12b+15b.26c
’l (prep.), vv. 13a.26a!
’ḥt/’ḥd, vv. 14a.23b!

vv. 4–7.16–18.27–30: *ḥyh*, vv. 4b.18b.28b+30b
hn … l’l/hn … yp‘l ’l, vv. 6a and 29a resp.—exactly linear; see also *’l* in v. 4a and 14a!, and *hn* in v. 12a
’nwš, vv. 16a.27a
gbr, vv. 17b.29b!—linear
npšw mny šḥt, vv. 18a.30a!—linear; see also *šḥt* in in v. 24b and 28a, and *mny* in v. 23b!
m‘br, vv. 18b.28a!—linear

vv. 6–7.8–9, ‘concatenatio’: *’ny*, vv. 6a+b.9a!; see also *’nky* in v. 9b
l’, vv. 7a+b.9b
vv. 29–30.31–33, ‘concat.’: *šwb* (hiph‘il), vv. 30a.32a

2.4.6 Remaining verbal repetitions

2.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

’m, *’mr*, *b-*, *hn* (v. 10), *-w*, *-y*, *yšr*, *-k*, *ky*, *l’*, *mn*, *-ny*, *‘l*, *ṣdq* (v. 32), *šwb*

2.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

’dm, *’lp/’lp*, *yš*, *kl*, *l-*, *mṣ’*, *pnym*, *ryb*, *škb*

2.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): …|1–3.4–7.8–11.12–13|14.15–18.19–22.23–24.25–28.29–30.31–33 (…|3.4.4.2|1.4.4.2.4.2.3)

Stickel (1842): …1–3.4–7.8–11.12–14.15–18|19–22.23–24.25–28|29–30.31–33 (…3.4.4.3.4|4.2.4|2.3)

Schlottmann (1851): …||1–3.4–5.6–7||8–9.10–11|12–13.14–15.16–18||19–20.21–22|23–24.25–26|27–28.29–30||31–33 (…||3.2.2||2.2|2.2.3||2.2|2.2|2.2||3)

Delitzsch (1876): …|1–3.4–7.8–12.13–18.19–22.23–24.25–28.29–33 (…|6.8.10.13.8.6.10.10)

Wright (1883): …|4–7.8–11.12–14|15–18.19–22.23–24|25–26.27–28.29–33 (…|8.8.6|9.8.6|5.6.10)

Dillmann (1891): …33,1–7|8–11.12–30.31–33

Bickell (1894): …1+3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10+12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19*+20*+21.22–23.24a–b+25.26a–b+27a+26c.27b–28

Ley (1895): 1–4.5–7.8–11.12–14.15–18.19–22.23–25.26–28.29–33 (4.3.4.4.3.4.4.4.3.4.5; 'Eine strophenartige Symmetrie ist nicht zu verkennen', p. 680)

Duhm (1897): 1–2.3+5.6–7|8–9.10+12.13–14.15–16.17–18|19–20.21–22.23–24a.24b–25.26–27a.27b–28.29–30; cf. Hölscher (1952)

Vetter (1897): …|1–3.5+4+6–7|8–11|12–14|15–18|19–22.23–26.27–28|29–30|31–33

Hontheim (1904): …|32,21–33,3|4–7.8–11|12–14|15–18.19–22|29–30+x|23–25.26–28 (…|5|4.4|3|4.4|4|4.4)

Schlögl (1916): 1–11.12–22.23–24+26–29a+30–33 (22.22.22)

Dhorme (1924), pp. 415–16: …15–18.19–22.23–24.25–28.29–30… ('Pas une de ces strophes n'a le même nombre d'hémistiches', p. 416)

Peters (1928): 1–3.4–5.6–7|8–9.10–11.12–13|14–15.16–18|19–20.21–22.23–24.25–26b.26c–28.29–30|31–33 (3.2.2|3×2|2.3|4×2.3.2|3)

König (1929): 1–7.8–11.12–30.31–33

Kissane (1939): 1–2+5–7.8–12.13–17.18–22.23–24+30+25.26–29 (6×5)

RSV (1952): 1–7.8–11.12–18.19–28.29–33

Möller (1955): 1–7.8–14.15–22.23–30.31–33 (7.7.8.8.3)

Fohrer (1963): 1–7.8–12.13–15a+15c–18.19–24.25–30 (7.5.7.7.7)

Terrien (1963): 1–4.5–7|8–11.12–13|14–15.16–18|19–22.23–24|25–26.27–28|29–30.31–33

Skehan (1969): 1–3.4–7.8–11|12–14.15–18.19–22.23–24.25–28.29–30.31–33 (3.4.4|3.4.4.3.4.2.3 > 11+23); cf. Dhorme (1924) and Mackenzie (1990)

NAB (1970): 1–4.5–7.8–11.12–18.19–22.23–24.25–26.27–28.29–33

TOB (1978): 1–7.8–13.14–18.19–28.29–33

De Wilde (1981): ...1–2.3+5.6+4.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20.21–22.23–24a.24b–25.26–27a.27b–28.29–30; cf. Duhm (1897)

Van Selms (1983): ...1–7.8–13.14–22.23–28.29–33

Rozelaar (1984): 1–7.8–11.12–14.15–18.19–24.25–28.29–30.31–33; cf. Habel (1985)

Webster (1984), pp. 101–02: *1–4*.5–7.8–12|13–15.16–18.19–22.23–25.26–28.*29–33* (3 and 6 strophes)

Habel (1985): 1–7.8–11.12–14.15–28.29–30...31–33 (a.b.c.d.c'.[b'.]a'; 'unbalanced literary structure', p. 459)

Hartley (1988): ...||1–7|8–11.12–30(=12–22.23–30)|31–33

MacKenzie (1990): 1–3.5–6+4+7|8–11|12–14.15–18|19–22.23–24|25–28.29–30 (3.4|4|3.4|4.3|4.2)

Wahl (1993): 1–7.8–12|13–18.19–22.23–28|29–33 (vv. 13–28 'Hauptteil')

3 Elihu’s second reply to Job: Job 34

Structure: 14.15.7 > 8.6|7.8|7 > 2.3.3|3.3||3.2.2|2.2.2.2||3.2.2

I.1	[2]	ŠM‘W ḤKMYM MLY	wYD‘YM H’ZYNW ly	
	[3]	ky ’ZN MLYN TBḤN	wḥk yṭ‘m lw ’kl	
	[4]	mšpṭ NBḤRH lnw	ND‘H BYNYNW MH ṭwb	
	[5]	ky ’mr ’YWB ṢDQTY	w’l hsyr mšpṭy	
	[6]	‘l mšpṭy ’kzb	’nwš ḥṣy bly PŠ‘	
	[7]	**my** GBR k’YWB	yšth l‘g kmym	
	[8]	w’rḥ lḥbrh ‘m P‘LY ’WN	wllkt ‘m ’nšy rš‘	
	[9]	ky ’mr l’ yskn GBR	brṣtw ‘m ’lhym	
I.2	[10]	LKN ’nšy lbb **šm‘w** ly	ḥllh l’l mrš‘	wšdy m‘wl
	[11]	ky p‘l ’DM yšlm lw	wk’rḥ ’yš ymṣ’nw	
	[12]	’p ’mnm ’l l’ yršy‘	wšdy l’ y‘wt mšpṭ	
	[13]	**my** pqd ‘lyw ’rṣh	WMY śm tbl klh	
	[14]	’m yśym ’LYW lbw	rwḥw wnšmtw ’lyw y’sp	
	[15]	ygw‘ kl bśr YḤD	w’DM ‘l ‘pr yšwb	

II.1	[16]	w’m bynh ŠM‘H z’t	H’ZYNH lqwl MLY	
	[17]	h’p śwn’ **mšpṭ** yḥbwš	w’m ṢDYQ **kbyr** tršy‘	
	[18]	h’mr lmlk bly‘l	rš‘ ’l ndybym	
	[19]	**’šr** l’ nś’ **pny** śrym	wl’ nkr šw‘ l**pny dl**	ky m‘śh ydyw klm
	[20]	rg‘ ymtw wḥṣwt lylh	yg‘šw **‘m** wy‘brw	**wysyrw** ’byr l’ byd
	[21]	ky ‘ynyw ‘l **drky** ’yš	**wkl** ṣ‘dyw yr’h	
	[22]	’yn ḥšk w’yn ṣlmwt	**lhstr** šm P‘LY ’WN	
II.2	[23]	ky l’ ‘l ’yš yśym ‘wd	lhlk ’l ’l **bmšpṭ**	
	[24]	yr‘ **kbyrym** l’ ḥqr	wy‘md ’ḥrym TḤTm	
	[25]	LKN ykyr m‘bdyhm	whpk lylh wydk’w	
	[26]	TḤT rš‘ym spqm	bmqwm r’ym	
	[27]	**’šr** ‘l kn **srw** m’ḥryw	**wkl drkyw** l’ hśkylw	
	[28]	lhby’ ‘LYW ṣ‘qt **dl**	wṣ‘qt ‘nyym yšm‘	

	29	*whw’ yšqṭ WMY yršy‘*	*w*ystr pnym *WMY yšwrnw*	
	30	*w‘l gwy w‘l ’DM YḤD*	*mmlk ’DM ḥnp mmqšy* **‘m**	

III	31	*ky ’l ’l h’mr*	*nś’ty l’ ’hbl*	
	32	*bl‘dy ’ḥzh ’th hrny*	*’m ‘wl p‘lty l’ ’syp*	
	33	*hm‘mk yšlmnh ky m’st*	*ky ’th TBḤR wl’ ’ny*	*wMH YD‘T* **dbr**
	34	**’nšy** *lbb y’mrw ly*	*wGBR ḤKM ŠM‘ ly*	
	35	*’YWB l’ bD‘T* **ydbr**	*w***dbry***w l’ bhśkyl*	
	36	*’by YBḤN ’YWB ‘d nṣḥ*	*‘l tšbt k’***nšy** *’WN*	
	37	*ky YSYP ‘l ḥṭ’tw PŠ‘*	*BYNYNW yspwq*	*wyrb ’mryw l’l*

3.1 Text

V. 3b—*lw ’kl*: ‘food for it’ (cf. Job 12,11); MT *l’kl* (‘eating’).

V. 18a—*h’mr*: MT *h-* interr. + inf. *’mr*; read with LXX, Pesh. and Vulg. *h-* (article) + part. *’mr* (‘who says’).

V. 30a: = MT v. 29c.

V. 31a—*h’mr*: MT *h-* interr. + 3 sing. masc. perf. *’mr*; read *h-* (article) + part. *’mr*.

V. 36b—*k’nšy*: ‘like men’; so pc Mss (Fohrer, De Wilde, Habel, Wahl). MT *b’nšy* (‘among men’).

3.2 Content

Elihu’s defence of God’s justice.

- I In the presence of the (three) friends, Elihu challenges Job’s accusation of God being somewhat casual with justice.
  - I.1 Job’s charges directed to God.
    - Wise men, listen to my words with discernment (vv. 2–3).
    - Let us find out for ourselves whether Job rightly sticks to his innocence before God (vv. 4–6).
    - (Elihu himself already provides an answer:) The statements by Job are very blasphemous (vv. 7–9).
  - I.2 God is not able to act unjustly.
    - Men of understanding (v. 10a; cf. v. 2), God does not pervert justice (vv. 10–12).
    - The creation as a whole is *dependent* on Him (vv. 13–15).
- II Against Job Elihu underlines that God takes the poor and oppressed people under his protection against the wicked wrongdoers (implicit

accusation: Job is an oppressor; cf. v. 8).

II.1 It is impossible to call the Almighty to account.

Listen carefully (v. 16): you cannot talk back to the Just One (vv. 17–18).

For their existence all people are *dependent* on Him (vv. 19–20; cf. vv. 13–15).

The wrongdoers cannot hide themselves from Him (vv. 21–22).

II.2 God destroys the wicked oppressors (vv. 23–26) and rescues the oppressed (vv. 27–30).

He shatters mighty men (vv. 23–24);
truly, because of their wicked doings He strikes them down (vv. 25–26).

Because they did not defend the poor and the needy (vv. 27–28).

If God should not intervene, who would act against the evildoers (vv. 29–30).

III Elihu concludes that Job argued very foolishly.

If a man should humbly address God and repent from his evil deeds, would God actually punish him? (vv. 31–33).

Men of understanding will admit that Job's argumentation was foolish (vv. 34–35).

He should be tested even more, because he increased his transgressions (vv. 36–37).

3.3 Transition markers

3.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

3.3.1.1 imperative: *šm‘w*, v. 2a
vocative: *ḥkmym*, v. 2a
vocative: *yd‘ym*, v. 2b
imperative: *h’zynw*, v. 2b
cohortative: *nbḥrh*, v. 4a
cohortative: *nd‘h*, v. 4b
mh, v. 4b
my, v. 7a
lkn, v. 10a
vocative: *’nšy lbb*, v. 10a
imperative: *šm‘w*, v. 10a
ḥllh l-, v. 10b
my, v. 13a
my, v. 13b
w- beginning line, v. 16a
imper. energ.: *bynh*, v. 16a
imper. energ.: *šm‘h*, v. 16a
z’t, v. 16a
imper. energ.: *h’zynh*, v. 16b
lkn, v. 25a
w- beginn. line, v. 29a; ext. // *w-* beginn. line in v. 30a
hw’, v. 29a
my, v. 29a
my, v. 29b

3.3.1.2 *'mr*, v. 31a

3.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

3.3.2.1 *'mr*, v. 9a
'p, v. 12a
'mr, v. 18a
rš', v. 18b
rš', v. 26a

3.3.2.2 *'mnm*, v. 12a
ḥnp, v. 30b
h- interr., v. 33a
'th, v. 33b; ext. // *'th* in v. 32a
'ny, v. 33b
mh, v. 33c
imperative: *dbr*, v. 33c

3.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

'mr, v. 5a
w- beginning line, v. 8a
h- interr., v. 17a
'p, v. 17a
'mr, v. 34a
'd nṣḥ, v. 36a

3.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

3.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

': *'dm*, vv. 11, 15, 30, 30; *'wn*, vv. 8, 22, 36; *'zn*, vv. 2, 3, 16; *'ḥr*, vv. 24, 27; *'ywb*, vv. 5, 7, 35, 36; *'yn*, vv. 22, 22; *'yš*, vv. 8, 10, 11, 21, 23, 34, 36; *'l* ('God'), vv. 5, 10, 12, 23, 31, 37 (see also *'lhym* in v. 9); *'l* (prep.), vv. 14, 14, 18, 23, 31; *'m*, vv. 14, 16, 17, 32; *'mr*, vv. 5, 9, 18, 31, 34, 37; *'sp*, vv. 14, 32; *'p*, vv. 12, 17; *'rḥ*, vv. 8, 11; *'šr*, vv. 19, 27; *'th*, vv. 32, 33

b: *b-*, vv. 9, 20, 23, 26, 35, 35; *bḥn*, vv. 3, 36; *bḥr*, vv. 4, 33; *byn* (prep.), vv. 4, 37; *blh*, vv. 6, 18, 32

g: *gbr*, vv. 7, 9, 34

d: *dbr*, vv. 33, 35, 35; *dl*, vv. 19, 28; *drk*, vv. 21, 27

h: *h-* (interr.), vv. 17, 33; *h-* (article), vv. 18*, 31*; *-h*, vv. 13, 33; *hlk*, vv. 8, 23

w: *-w*, vv. 3*, 9, 11, 13, 14 (5×), 19, 21, 21, 27, 27, 28, 37, 37

ḥ: *ḥkm*, vv. 2, 34

y: *-y*, vv. 2, 2, 5, 6, 6, 10, 16, 34, 34; *yd*, vv. 19, 20; *yd'*, vv. 2, 4, 33, 35; *yḥd*, vv. 15, 30

k: *k-*, vv. 7, 7, 11, 36*; *kbyr*, vv. 17, 24; *ky*, vv. 3, 5, 9, 11, 19, 21, 23, 31, 33, 33, 37; *kl*, vv. 13, 15, 19, 21, 27; *kn*, vv. 10, 25, 27

l: *l-*, vv. 2, 3, 4, 8, 8, 10 (3×), 11, 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 28, 34, 34, 37; *l’*, vv. 9, 12, 12, 19, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 31, 32, 33, 35, 35; *lbb*, vv. 10, 34 (see also *lb* in v. 14); *lylh*, vv. 20, 25

m: *-m*, vv. 19, 24, 26; *mh*, vv. 4, 33; *my*, vv. 7, 13, 13, 29, 29; *mll*, vv. 2, 3, 16; *mlk*, vv. 18, 30; *mn*, vv. 10, 10, 27, 30, 30, 33

n: *-nw* (3 sing. masc.), vv. 11, 29; *-nw* (1 pl.), vv. 4, 4, 37; *nkr*, vv. 19, 25; *nś’*, vv. 19, 31

s: *swr*, vv. 5, 20, 27; *spq*, vv. 26, 37; *str*, vv. 22, 29

‘: *‘wl*, vv. 10, 32; *‘l*, vv. 6, 13, 15, 21, 23, 27, 28, 30, 30, 36, 37; *‘m* (‘people’), vv. 20, 30; *‘m* (prep.), 8, 8, 9, 33

p: *pnh*, vv. 19, 19, 29; *p‘l*, vv. 8, 11, 22, 32; *pš‘*, vv. 6, 37

ṣ: *ṣdq*, vv. 5, 17; *ṣ‘q*, vv. 28, 28

r: *r’h*, vv. 21, 26; *rš‘*, vv. 8, 10, 12, 17, 18, 26, 29

ś: *śym*, vv. 13, 14, 23; *śkl*, vv. 27, 35

š: *šdy*, vv. 10, 12; *šwb*, vv. 15, 36; *šlm*, vv. 11, 33; *šm‘*, vv. 2, 10, 16, 28, 34; *špṭ*, vv. 4, 5, 6, 12, 17, 23

t: *tḥt*, vv. 24, 26

3.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *ḥkmym*/*ḥk*, vv. 2a and 3b resp.—alliteration
mlyn, vv. 2a.3a
’zn, vv. 2b.3a
vv. 4–6: *mšpṭ*, vv. 4a.5b.6a; note *mšpṭy* in vv. 5b and 6a!
-y, vv. 5b.6a+b
vv. 7–9: *gbr*, vv. 7a.9a—inclusio
‘m (prep.), vv. 8a+b.9b
vv. 10–12: *’yš*, vv. 10a.11b
’l (‘God’), vv. 10b.12a—inclusio
rš‘, vv. 10b.12a—inclusio
wšdy, vv. 10c.12b!
vv. 13–15: *‘l*, vv. 13a.15b—inclusio
kl, vv. 13b.15a—inclusio
śym, vv. 13b.14a
vv. 16–18: *w’m*, vv. 16a.17b
rš‘, vv. 17b.18b
vv. 19–20: *l’*, vv. 19a+b.20c
yd, vv. 19c.20c!
vv. 23–24: *l’*, vv. 23a.24a
yśym ‘wd/*wy‘md*, vv. 23a and 24b resp.—alliteration
vv. 27–28: *‘l* , vv. 27a.28a

vv. 31–33:	*ky*, vv. 31a.33a+b—inclusio
	l’, vv. 31b.32b.33b
	’th, vv. 32a.33b!
vv. 36–37:	*‘l*, vv. 36b.37a

3.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 2–9 (I.1):	*yd‘*, vv. 2b.4b—linear
	ky ’mr, vv. 5a.9a!
	’ywb, vv. 5a.7a
vv. 10–15 (I.2):	*lbb/lb*, vv. 10a and 14a respectively
	’dm, vv. 11a.15b
vv. 16–22 (II.1):	*ky*, vv. 19c.21a—linear
	kl, vv. 19c.21b—linear
	ymtw/ṣlmwt, vv. 20a and 22a resp.—alliteration
vv. 23–30 (II.2):	*tḥt*, vv. 24b.26a!—linear
	-m, vv. 24b.26a—linear
	’ḥr, vv. 24b.27a!
	lkn/‘l kn, vv. 25a and 27a respectively

3.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–15 (canto I):	*šm‘w*, vv. 2a.10a—linear
	ḥkmym (vocative)/*’nšy lbb* (vocative), vv. 2a and 10a resp.—linear
	ly, vv. 2b.10a—linear; see also *mly* in v. 2a
	my, vv. 7a.13a—exactly linear; see also *my* in v. 13b
	’rḥ, vv. 8a.11b!
	p‘l, vv. 8a.11a—‘concatenatio’
	wllkt/kl, vv. 8b and 13b+15a resp. (alliteration) —linear
	’nšy rš‘/’nšy lbb, vv. 8b and 10a resp.—concat.
	rš‘, vv. 8b.10b+12a—‘concatenatio’
	l’, vv. 9a.12a+b—‘concatenatio’
	’lhym/’l, vv. 9b.10b+12a resp.—concatenatio
vv. 16–30 (canto II):	*mšpṭ*, vv. 17a.23b—linear
	kbyr, vv. 17b.24a!—linear
	rš‘ hiph‘il ... *rš‘/rš‘* ... *rš‘* hiph‘il, vv. 17b+18b. 26a+29a—‘inclusio’
	mlk, vv. 18a.30b!—‘inclusio’

’šr, vv. 19a.27a!—‘linear’
pnym, vv. 19a+b.29b!
nkr, vv. 19b.25a!
dl, vv. 19b.28a!
-m, vv. 19c.24b+26a!
lylh, vv. 20a.25b!
‘m, vv. 20b.30b!
swr, vv. 20c.27a—‘linear’
ky . . . *‘l* (. . .) *’yš*, vv. 21a and 23a resp.! —‘concatenatio’
drky . . . *wkl/wkl drky* , vv. 21 and 27b resp.!; see also *kl* in v. 19c
r’h, vv. 21b26b!
str hiph‘il, vv. 22b.29b!—linear

vv. 31–37 (canto III): *’mr*, vv. 31a.34a.37c; note *y’mrw/ ’mryw* in vv. 34a and 37c respectively
yd‘, vv. 33c.35a
dbr, vv. 33c.35a+b!—linear
ky, vv. 31a+33a+b.37a—‘inclusio’
’l (‘God’), vv. 31a.37c—inclusio
’nšym, vv. 34a.36b—linear
’ywb, vv. 35a.36a—concatenatio

3.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

vv. 2–9.16–22.31–37: *šm‘*, vv. 2a.16a—linear; see also v. 34b
ḥkm, vv. 2a.34b!
mly, vv. 2a.16b—linear; see also *mlyn* in v. 3a! —linear
yd‘, vv. 2b+4b.33c+35a!—linear
h’zyn, vv. 2b.16b—linear; see also *’zn* in v. 3a! —linear
ly, vv. 2b.34a+b; see also *mly* in v. 16b (alliter.) —exactly linear with *ly* in v. 2b
bḥn, vv. 3a.36a!
bḥr, vv. 4a.33b!
bynynw, vv. 4b.37b!; see also *-nw* (1 pl.) in v. 4a!
mh, vv. 4b.33c!
’mr, vv. 5a+9a.18a.31a+34a+37c!; note *h’mr* in vv. 18 and 31!—linear

'ywb, vv. 5a+7a.35a+36a!
ṣdq, vv. 5a.17b!
swr, vv. 5b.20c—linear
bly/bly'l/bl'dy, vv. 6b, 18a and 32a respectively!
pš', vv. 6b.37a!
gbr, vv. 7a+9a.34b!
p'ly 'wn, vv. 8a.22b!—linear; see also *'wn* in v. 36b! (linear) and *p'l* in v. 32b
'm (prep.), vv. 8a+b+9b.33a!
h- interr., vv. 17a.33a!—linear
nś', vv. 19a.31b!

vv. 10–15.23–30: *lkn*, vv. 10a.25a!—'linear'; see also *'l kn* in v. 27a!
'l ('God'), vv. 10b+12a.23b—linear
'dm, vv. 11a+15b.30a+b!
-nw (3 sing. masc.), vv. 11b.29b!
mšpṭ, vv. 12b.23b—linear
'l, vv. 13a+15b.27a+28a+30a (2×)—linear; note *'lyw* in vv. 13a and 28a!—'linear'
śym, vv. 13b+14a.23a!
wmy, vv. 13b.29a+b!—linear; see also *my* in v. 13a
ygw'/gwy, vv. 15a and 30a respectively (alliter.) —linear
yḥd, vv. 15a.30a!—exactly linear

vv. 10–15.31–37: *'nšy lbb*, vv. 10a.34a!
'wl, vv. 10c.32b!—linear
šlm, vv. 11a.33a—linear
'l, vv. 13a+15a.36b+37a—linear
'sp, vv. 14b.32b!
šwb, vv. 15b.36b!—linear

3.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

3.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration

'l ('God'; v. 5), *'m*, *-w*, *ky*, *l-*, *l'*, *'l* (v. 6), *šm'* (v. 28)

3.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration

(*'yn*), *'l* (prep.), *'p*, *b-*, *-h*, *hlk*, *k-*, *mn*, *spq*, (*ṣ'q*), *škl*

3.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 2–4.5–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–18|19–22.23–24.25–28.29–32.33–34.35–37|... (3.2.4×3|4.2.4.4.2.3|...)

Stickel (1842): 2–6.7–11.12–16|17–20.21–24.25–28|29–33.34–37 (3×5|3×4|5.4)

Schlottmann (1851): 2–3.4–6.7–9||10–12.13–15.16–18|19–24.25–28|29–33.34–37||... (2.3.3||3.3.3|6(=2.2.2).4(=2.2)|5(=2.3).4(=2.2)||...)

Delitzsch (1876): 2–4.5–9.10–11.12–15.16–20.21–23.24–28.29–32.33–37 (6.10.5.8.12.6.10.9.13)

Wright (1883): 2–3.4–6.7–9.10–12.19–20|21–24.25–28.29a–b+13–15.16–17|18+29c–32.33–34.35–37.35,2–3|... (4.4×6|8.8.8.4|9.5.7.4|...)

Dillmann (1891): 2–4.5–9|10–11.12–15.16–30|31–37

Bickell (1894): 33,31a+34,1–2.5–6.8–9.10–11.12–13.14–15.16–17.18a+19.20b–21.22+24a+25a.26–27.34–35.36–37

Ley (1895): 2–4.5–9.10–12.13–15.16–20.21–24.25–30.31–33.34–37 (3.5.3.3.5.4.6.3.4[?])

Duhm (1897): 2+4.5–6.7–8.9–10a*.10b–11.12–13.14–15 (addressed to the friends); 33,31–32.33+34,3.16–17.18–19b.19c–20.21–22.23–24.26+28.29–30.31–32.33.34–35.36–37b (addressed to Job)

Vetter (1897): 2–4|5–6.7–9|10–12|13–15|16–19|20–22.23–25.26–28|29–30.31–33|34–37

Hontheim (1904): 33,31–33|34,2–4||5–9+36||10–15.16–20||21–24.25–28||29–32|33–35+37||... (3.3|6|6.6|8|4.4|...)

Schlögl (1916): 2–9.10–15.16–22.23–30.31–37a+c (5×16)

Peters (1928): 2–4.5–6.7–9.10–12.13–15.16–17.18–19b.19c–20.21–22.23–24.25–26.27–28.29–30.31–32.33–34.35–37 (3.2.3×3.10×2.3)

König (1929): 2–4.5–9.10–15.16–30.31–37

Kissane (1939): 33,31–33+34,2–4.5–10a.10b–15.16–20.21–22+25+23–24+26.27–32.33–37a+c (7×6)

RSV (1952): 2–9.10–15.16–20.21–30.31–37; cf. Schlögl (1916) and Rozelaar (1984)

Möller (1955): 2–8.9–15.16–24.25–33.34–37 (7.7.9.9.4)

Fohrer (1963): 2–9.10–15.16–22.23–29b.31–33b+34–37a+c (8.7.8.7.7); cf. Schlögl (1916)

Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–11|12–15.16–17|18–20.21–22|23–26.27–28|29–30.31–33a|33b–35.36–37

NAB (1970): 2–6.7–9.10–15.16–21.22+25+23–24+27–28.29–33.34–37

TOB (1978): 2–4.5–9|10–17|18–30|31–33.34–37

De Wilde (1981): 2+4.5–6.7–8.9–10a*.10b–11.12–13.12,7–8.9–10.34,14–15.16–17.18–19b.19c+25a+21.22–23.24+25b+20a.20b–c+26.27–28.

29–30|31–32.33.34–35.36–37
Van Selms (1983): 2–9.10–16.17–22.23–30.31–33.34–37; cf. Fohrer (1963)
Webster (1984), pp. 102–03: 2–4.5–9.10–12.13–15 (addressed to the 'wise men')|16–20.21–25.26–30.31–33.34–37 (addressed to Job)
Habel (1985): 2–4.5–9.10–15.16–30.31–33.34–37 (a.b.c.d.b'.a')
Hartley (1988): 2–4||5–9|10–15.16–30|31–33||34–37
Wahl (1993): 2–4.5–9|10–15|16–22|23–30|31–33.34–37

4 Elihu’s third reply to Job: Job 35

Structure: 7.8 > 3.4|4.4 (a.b|b’.a’) > 2.1|2.2||2.2|2.2

I.1	[2]	*hz’t ḥšbt lmšpṭ*	*’mrt ṣdqy m’l*
	[3]	*KY T’MR mh yskn lk*	*mh ’‘yl m***ḥṭ’ty**
	[4]	*’ny ’šybk MLYN*	*w’t r‘yk ‘mk*
I.2	[5]	*hbṭ ŠMYM wr’h*	*wšwr šḥqym gbhw mmk*
	[6]	*’m* **ḥṭ’t** *mh tp‘l bw*	*wRBW pš‘yk mh T‘ŚH lw*
	[7]	*’m ṣdqt mh TTN lw*	*’w mh mydk yqḥ*
	[8]	*l’yš kmwk rš‘k*	*wlbn ’dm ṣdqtk*

II.1	[9]	*mRB ‘šwqym yz‘yqw*	*yšw‘w mzrw‘ RBYM*
	[10]	WL’ **’mr** *’yh ’lwh ‘Śy*	*NTN zmrwt blylh*
	[11]	*mlpnw mbhmwt ’rṣ*	*wm‘wp hŠMYM yḥkmnw*
	[12]	*šm yṣ‘qw* WL’ *y‘nh*	*mpny g’wn r‘ym*
II.2	[13]	*’k šw’ l’ yšm‘ ’l*	*wšdy l’ yšwrnh*
	[14]	*’p KY T’MR l’ tšwrnw*	*dyn lpnyw wtḥwll lw*
	[15]	*w‘th ky ’yn pqd ’pw*	*wl’ yd‘ bpš m’d*
	[16]	*w’ywb hbl ypṣh pyhw*	*bbly d‘t MLYN ykbr*

4.1 Text

V. 14b—*wtḥwll*: from a root *ḥyl*, ‘to wait’; cf. Ps. 37,7 (Kroeze, Van Selms; cf. Wahl).

V. 15b—*bpš*: = *bpš‘* (Dhorme, Gordis, Habel; cf. Wahl); cf. LXX and Vulg.

4.2 Content

Elihu’s defence of God’s reticence.

I God remains silent because man’s bad or good actions leave heaven unmoved.
  I.1 You say: it makes little difference whether a man serves God or not (vv. 2–3);
  I will give you an answer (v. 4).
  I.2 When you look at the sky then you will understand that

neither your sins nor your righteousness has any influence on God (vv. 5–8).

II God does not react to man's cry for help because he does not acknowledge Him as the Creator.
  II.1 Men only complain to God, without acknowledging Him as their Maker (vv. 9–10);
  therefore, He does not respond to their cry for help (vv. 11–12).
  II.2 Surely God does not listen to arrogant talk (vv. 13–14);
  but nevertheless Job wants to talk back to God (vv. 15–16).

4.3 Transition markers

4.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

4.3.1.1 *h*- interr., v. 2a
z't, v. 2a
'ny, v. 4a
imperative: *hbṭ*, v. 5a
imperative: *r'h*, v. 5a
imperative: *šwr*, v. 5b
mh, v. 7a
mh, v. 7b
'k, v. 13a
w- beginn. line, v. 15a; ext. // *w*- beginn. line in v. 16a
'th, v. 15a

4.3.1.2 no remarks

4.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

4.3.2.1 *'mr*, v. 3a; ext. // *'mr* in v. 2b
'mr, v. 10a
'p, v. 14a
'mr, v. 14a

4.3.2.2 no remarks

4.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

mh, v. 3a
mh, v. 3b
mh, v. 6a
mh, v. 6b
w- beginning line, v. 10a
'yh, v. 10a

4.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective

4.4.1 GENERAL SURVEY

': *'l* (/ *'lwh*), vv. 2, 10 (*'lwh*), 13; *'m*, vv. 6, 7; *'mr*, vv. 2, 3, 10, 14
b: *b*-, vv. 6, 10, 15, 16
h: *-hw*, vv. 14, 16
w: *-w*, vv. 6, 6, 7, 14, 14, 15

ḥ: *ḥṭ’*, vv. 3, 6
y: *-y*, vv. 2, 3, 10; *yd‘*, vv. 15, 16
k: *-k*, vv. 3, 4 (3×), 5, 6, 7, 8 (3×); *ky*, vv. 3, 14, 15
l: *l-*, vv. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 8, 14, 14; *l’*, vv. 10, 12, 13, 13, 14, 15
m: *mh*, vv. 3, 3, 6, 6, 7, 7; *mlh*, vv. 4, 16; *mn*, vv. 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 9, 11, 11, 12
n: *-nw* (1 pl.), vv. 11, 11; *ntn*, vv. 7, 10
‘: *‘śh*, vv. 6, 10
p: *pnh*, vv. 12, 14; *pš‘*, vv. 6, 15*
ṣ: *ṣdq*, vv. 2, 7, 8
r: *rbb*, vv. 6, 9, 9
š: *šwr*, vv. 5, 13, 14; *šmym*, vv. 5, 11

4.4.2 WITHIN THE STROPHES

vv. 2–3: *l-*, vv. 2a.3a—linear
’mr, vv. 2b.3a
-y, vv. 2b.3b
mn, vv. 2b.3b—linear
vv. 7–8: *ṣdq*, vv. 7a.8b
vv. 9–10: *mzrw‘/zmrwt*, vv. 9b and 10b resp. (alliter.)—linear
vv. 13–14: *l’*, vv. 13a+b.14a
šwr, vv. 13b.14a
vv. 15–16: *w-*, vv. 15a.16a—exactly linear
-w/-hw, vv. 15a and 16a resp.—exactly linear
wl’/bbly, vv. 15b and 16b resp.—exactly linear
yd‘, vv. 15b.16b!
b-, vv. 15b.16b

4.4.3 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 5–8 (I.2): *mn*, vv. 5b.7b—linear
’m, vv. 6a.7a!—concatenatio
mh, vv. 6a+b.7a+b—concatenatio
pš‘yk/rš‘k, vv. 6b and 8a resp.—linear
lw, vv. 6b.7a—concatenatio; see also *bw* in v. 6a
vv. 9–12 (II.1): *mn*, vv. 9a+b.11a+b+12b
yz‘yqw/yṣ‘qw, vv. 9a and 12a resp. (alliter.)—inclusio
mzrw‘/r‘ym, vv. 9b and 12b resp. (alliter.)—inclusio
vv. 13–16 (II.2): *šw’/hbl*, vv. 13a and 16a resp.—inclusio
’p/’p, vv. 14a and 15a resp. (alliter.)—concatenatio
ky, vv. 14a.15a—concatenatio

-*hw*, vv. 14a.16a!—exactly linear
-*w*, vv. 14b (2×).15a—concatenatio

4.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

vv. 2–8 (canto I): -*k*, vv. 3a+4 (3×).5b+6b+7b+8 (3×)!; note (3×) -*k* in vv. 4 and 8—linear
ṣdq, vv. 2b.7a+8b!—inclusio; see also *špṭ* in v. 2a
mh, vv. 3a+b.6–7!
ḥṭ’, vv. 3b.6a!—linear

vv. 9–16 (canto II): *wl’*, vv. 10a.12a.15b!; see also *l’* in vv. 13a+b and 14a!
’mr, vv. 10a.14a—linear
’lwh/’l, vv. 10a and 13a resp.—linear
mlpnw/lpnyw, vv. 11a and 14b resp.—alliteration
šm yṣ‘qw wl’/šw’ l’ yšm‘ ’l, vv. 12a and 13a resp. (alliteration)—concatenatio
pnym, vv. 12b.14b!

4.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

The symmetric arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 2–4.13–16: *’l*, vv. 2b.13a! (linear)
ky t’mr, vv. 3a.14a! (linear); see also *ky* in v. 15a! and *’mr* in v. 2b
mlyn, vv. 4a.16b (linear)

vv. 5–8.9–12: *šmym*, vv. 5a.11b!
rbb, vv. 6b.9a+b! (linear)
‘śh, vv. 6b.10a! (linear); see also *p‘l* in v. 6a
ntn, vv. 7a.10b!

The linear arrangement of the cantos.

vv. 2–4.9–12: -*y*, vv. 2b+3b.10a!—linear
r‘yk/r‘ym, vv. 4b and 12b respectively (alliter.)—linear

vv. 5–8.13–16: *šwr*, vv. 5b.13b+14a!—linear
pš‘/pš, vv. 6b and 15b respectively
lw, vv. 6b.14b—exactly linear; see also v. 7a (!) and -*w* in vv. 6a, 14b, 15a (!)

4.4.6 REMAINING VERBAL REPETITIONS

4.4.6.1 Partially left out of consideration
b-, *l-*

4.4.6.2 Totally left out of consideration
(*-nw*; 1 pl.)

4.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): ...|2–4.5–8.9–12.13–16 (...|3.3×4)
Stickel (1842): 2–4|5–8.9–12.13–16 (3|3×4)
Schlottmann (1851): ...||2–4.5–8|9–12.13–16 (...||3.4|4.4)
Delitzsch (1876): 2–4.5–8.9–13.14–16 (6.8.10.6)
Wright (1883): ...|4–5.6–8.9–11.12–14.15–16 (...|4.6.6.6.4)
Dillmann (1891): 2–8.9–16; similarly König (1929), RSV (1952), Van Selms (1983)
Bickell (1894): 2–3.5–6.7a+10b–11.13–14
Ley (1895): 2–4.5–8.9–12.13–16 (3.4.4.4)
Duhm (1897): 2–3.4–5.6–7.8+16.10–11.9+12.13–14 (addressed to Job and to the friends)
Vetter (1897): 2–4|5–8|9–11.12–13|14–16
Hontheim (1904): ...||2–5+25,2–3+35,6–8||9–12.13–16 (...|9|4.4)
Schlögl (1916): 2–7.8–13.14–16 (12.12.6)
Peters (1928): 2–4|5–6.7–8|9–11.12–14|15–16 (3|2.2|3.3|2)
Kissane (1939): 2–4.5–7.8–9+12.10–11+13.14–16 (5×3)
Möller (1955): 2–4.5–8.9–12.13–14.15–16 (3.4.4.2.2)
Fohrer (1963): 33,31–33+35,2–3.4–8|9–14.15–16+36,2–4|... (5.5|6.5|...)
Terrien (1963): 2–4.5–8|9–12.13–16; cf. Schlottmann (1851)
NAB (1970): 2–8.9–12.13–16
TOB (1978): 2–4.5–8|9–13.14–16; cf. Delitzsch (1876) and Habel (1985)
De Wilde (1981): 33,31–32.33+35,4.2–3.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12.13–14.15–16
Webster (1984), pp. 103–04: 2–4.5–8.9–12.13–16
Habel (1985): 2–4.5–8.9–13.14–16 (a.b.b'.a')
Hartley (1988): 2–4.5-16
Wahl (1993): 2–4|5–8.9–13|14–16 (vv. 5–13 'Hauptstück')

5 Elihu’s fourth reply to Job: Job 36–37

Structure: 3 21.22.11 > 3 8.9.4|8.10.4|7.4 > 3 3.3.2||3.3.3||2.2|||2.2|2.2||
1.2.2|2.3||2.2|||1.2.2.2||2.2

A	[2]	*ktr ly z‘yr w’ḥwk*	*ky ‘wd l’lwh mlym*	
	[3]	*’ś’ d‘y lMRḤWQ*	*wlP‘Ly ’tn ṣdq*	
	[4]	*ky ’mnm l’ šqr mly*	*tmym d‘wt ‘mk*	
I.1	[5]	*HN ’L KBYR WL’ ym’s*	*KBYR KḤ LB*	
	[6]	*l’* **yḥyh** *rš‘*	*WMŠPṬ ‘nyym ytn*	
	[7]	*l’ YGR‘ mṢDYQ ‘ynyw*	*w’t mlkym lks’*	*wyšybm lnṣḥ wygbhw*
	[8]	*w’m ’swrym bzqym*	*ylkdwn bḥbly ‘ny*	
	[9]	*wygd lhm p‘lm*	*wpš‘yhm ky ytgbrw*	
	[10]	*wygl ’znm lmwsr*	*wy’mr ky yšbwn m’wn*	
	[11]	*’m yšm‘w wy‘bdw*	*yklw ymyhm bṭwb*	*wšnyhm bn‘ymym*
	[12]	*w’m l’ yšm‘w*	*bšlḥ y‘brw*	*wygw‘w bbly d‘t*
I.2	[13]	*wḥnpy LB yśymw ’p*	*l’ yšw‘w ky ’srm*	
	[14]	*tmt bn‘r npšm*	**wḥyt***m bqdšym*	
	[15]	*yḥlṣ ‘ny b‘nyw*	*wygl blḥṣ ’znm*	
	[16]	*w’p hsytk mpy* ṢR	*rḥb l’ mwṣq tḥtyh*	*wnḥt šlḥnk ml’ dšn*
	[17]	*wdyn rš‘ ml’t*	*dyn wmšpṭ ytmkw*	
	[18]	*ky ḥmh pn ysytk bspq*	*wrb kpr ’l yṭk*	
	[19]	*hy‘rk šw‘k l’ b*ṢR	*wkl m’mṣy kḥ*	
	[20]	*’l tš’p hlylh*	*l‘lwt ‘mym tḥtm*	
	[21]	*hšmr ’l tpn ’l ’wn*	*ky ‘l zh bḥrt m‘ny*	
I.3	[22]	**hn ’l** *yśgyb bKḤw*	*my kmhw mwrh*	
	[23]	*my pqd ‘lyw drkw*	*wmy ’mr P‘LT ‘wlh*	
	[24]	*zkr ky TŚGY’ P‘Lw*	*’šr šrrw ’NŠYM*	
	[25]	*kl ’dm ḥzw bw*	*’nwš ybyṭ MRḤWQ*	
II.1.1	[26]	*HN ’L ŚGY’ WL’* **nd‘**	*mspr šnyw WL’ ḥqr*	
	[27]	KY *YGR‘ nṭpy mym*	*yzqw mṭr l’dw*	

[28] *’šr yzlw šḥqym*   *yr‘pw ‘ly ’dm rb*
[29] *’p ’m ybyn mprśy* **‘b**   *tš’wt sktw*

II.1.2 [30] HN *prś ‘lyw ’wrw*   *wšršy hym* ksh
[31] KY *bm ydyn ‘mym*   **ytn** *’kl lmkbyr*

[32] *‘l kpym* ksh *’wr*   *wyṣw ‘lyh bmpgy‘*
[33] *ygyd ‘lyw r‘w*   *mqnh ’p ‘l‘wlh*

II.2.1 [1] **’p** *lz’t yḥrd LBy*   *wytr mmqwmw*

[2] šm‘w šmw‘ *brgz qlw*   *whgh mpyw yṣ’*
[3] *tḥt kl hšmym yšrhw*   *w’wrw ‘l knpwt h’rṣ*

[4] *’ḥryw yš’g qwl*   *yr‘m bqwl g’wnw*   *wl’ y‘qbm ky* yšm‘ *qwlw*
[5] *yr‘m ’l bqwlw npl’wt*   *‘śh gdlwt* **wl’ nd‘**

II.2.2 [6] *ky lšlg y’mr hw’ ’rṣ*   *wgšm mṭrwt ‘zw*
[7] *byd kl ’dm yḥtwm*   *ld‘t kl ’nšym m‘śhw*

[8] *wtb’ ḥyh bmw ’rb*   *wbm‘wntyh tškn*
[9] *mn hḥdr tbw’ swph*   *wmmzrym qrh*
[10] *mnšmt ’l* **ytn** *qrḥ*   *wrḥb mym bmwṣq*

II.3 [11] **’p** *bry yṭryḥ* **‘b**   *ypyṣ ‘nn ’wrw*
[12] *whw’ msbwt mthpk*   *btḥbwltw lP‘Lm*

kl ’šr yṣwm   *‘l pny tbl ’rṣh*
[13] *’m lšbṭ ’m l’ rṣw*   *’m lḥsd YMṢ’HW*

III.1 [14] *h’zynh z’t ’ywb*   *‘md whtbwnn npl’wt ’l*

[15] *htd‘ bśwm ’lwh ‘lyhm*   *whwpy‘ ’wr ‘nnw*
[16] *htd‘ ‘l mplśy ‘b*   *mpl’wt tmym d‘ym*

[17] *’šr bgdyk ḥmym*   *bhšqṭ ’rṣ mdrwm*
[18] *trqy‘ ‘mw lšḥqym*   *ḥzqym kr’y mwṣq*

[19] *hwdy‘nw mh n’mr lw*   *l’ n‘rk mpny ḥšk*
[20] *hyspr lw ky ’dbr*   *’m ’mr ’yš ky ybl‘*

III.2 [21] *w'th l' r'w 'wr* *bhyr hw' bšḥqym* *wrwḥ 'brh wtṭhrm*
[22] *mṣpwn zhb y'th* *'l 'lwh nwr' hwd*

[23] *šdy l' MṢ'NHW* *ŚGY' KḤ WMŠPṬ* *wrb ṢDQH l' y'nh*
[24] *lkn yr'whw 'NŠYM* *l' yr'h kl ḥkmy LB*

5.1 Text

On several places the text of this poem is very obscure.

36,5b: 'He is mighty in strength of heart'; so MT (cf. Habel and Wahl). Many scholars doubt the integrity of this colon; see, however, *kḥ* and *lb* in anal. 5.4.4–5.

V. 12: I divide this verse into a tricolon which parallels v. 11 (with Rozelaar and Hartley).

V. 12c—*bbly*: see BHS; MT *kbly*.

V. 16b–c—*tḥtyh wnḥt*: many critics take these verbs as a case of dittography (Budde, Dhorme, Habel).

V. 19a: the meaning of this colon is virtually impossible to ascertain (see Hartley).

V. 21b—*bḥrt*: I read this verb as a pu'al (with NJPS and Habel); MT qal.

V. 29a—*'m*: so MT (cf. Delitzsch, Gordis, Hartley); Budde, Kroeze, De Wilde, Habel (among others) read *my* (cf. BHS).

V. 33b—*'l'wlh*: 'storm' (Gordis, De Wilde, Habel, Hartley); MT *'l 'wlh* ('on one coming up'). The meaning of *mqnh* remains uncertain.

37,6b—*wgšm*: MT reads *wgšm mṭr* before v. 6b; I delete these words as dittography (with Budde, Dhorme, Hölscher, De Wilde, Hartley; cf. Fohrer).

V. 6b—*'zw*: 'be strong' (with Dhorme, RSV, Fohrer, De Wilde, among others); the vocalization of MT points to 'his strength'.

V. 7b—*'nšym* (*m'śhw*): so Delitzsch, Budde, Dhorme, Hölscher, Hartley (cf. Van Selms and Habel). MT *'nšy m'śhw* (so Kroeze) is probably due to haplography.

V. 9b—*mzrym*: 'die Schaufeln/Bären' (De Wilde); 'die Nordwinde' (HAL, Wahl). Hontheim, Budde, Driver-Gray, NBG and Habel read *mzwym* ('the storehouses'); cf. Ps. 144,13.

V. 12: I take this verse as two lines, with two cola each (cf. Wahl); the first caesura comes after *mthpk* (Rozelaar). Next, with MT (!) I read a caesura after *lp'lm* (cf. Delitzsch); most critics connect this word with v. 12c.

V. 13a—*'m l' rṣw*: 'if they are not willing' (Hitzig, Gordis, Hartley; cf. Tur-Sinai). MT *'m l'rṣw* ('if for his land').

V. 20b—*ybl'*: 'is he informed?'; so Jacob (*ZAW* [1912], p. 287), Dhorme, Fohrer, TOB, Rozelaar, Wahl (cf. NEB).

V. 23: with most critics I take this verse as a tricolon. In MT the main caesura comes after *kḥ* (cf. part VI, 2.1).

5.2 Content

Elihu's second defence of God's justice.

- A Job, for just a while, pay attention to my wise words (introduction; vv. 2–4).
- I God speaks to men through affliction and misery.
  - I.1 The adversity of the righteous is to be taken as an admonition from God (about men in general).
    - God blesses the righteous (vv. 5–7).
    - When they land in trouble, He uses that situation to get them to repent (vv. 8–10).
    - When they pay heed to His admonition, then they will live in prosperity (vv. 11–12).
  - I.2 Likewise, Job's misery has to keep him back from great transgression (about Job in particular).
    - The wicked will receive their punishment in time (vv. 13–14; cf. v. 12—'thematic connection'), but God rescues the lowly from distress (v. 15).
    - God's trial has to bring you too, to repentance (vv. 16–18).
    - So, do not turn to mischief, lest an even worse trial will befall you (vv. 19–21).
  - I.3 Reference to God's greatness.
    - God is so supreme that men cannot reproach Him for His conduct (vv. 22–23).
    - Man has to extol His works (*man's reaction to God's greatness*; vv. 24–25).
- II God speaks towards human beings through His works in nature.
  - II.1 God's greatness (cf. I.3—'thematic extension') manifests itself when one observes the clouds (II.1.1) and the lightning (II.1.2).
    - II.1.1 God is incomprehensibly great (v. 26) because he forms the clouds and causes the rain to fall (vv. 27–29).
    - II.1.2 He also flashes His lightning to judge the world (vv. 30–31).
      The lightning and the thunderstorm accompany Him (vv. 32–33).
  - II.2 The thunderstorm (II.2.1), the wintry precipitation and cold (II.2.2) are all God's work.
    - II.2.1 The following features deeply impress me (v. 1).
      Listen to His roaring voice (vv. 2–3).

God is surrounded by the thunder of His voice (vv. 4–5).

II.2.2 God commands the snow and the rain (vv. 6–7).
He also rules over the (wintry) storm and cold (vv. 8–10).

II.3 The purpose of the natural phenomena (summary and provisional conclusion).
God shows his creative power in nature (vv. 11–12) to judge human beings according to their good or evil deeds (v. 13).

III This mighty God is (also) very righteous.

III.1 Before God's works in nature man is speechless.
Job, pay attention to these phenomena (v. 14).
Have you any understanding of the working of the lightning and the clouds? (vv. 15–16).
Can you spread out the firmament? (vv. 17–18).
Are we not silent before God? (vv. 19–20).

III.2 God's righteousness.
God is invested with awesome majesty (vv. 21–22).
The Almighty is all righteousness (vv. 23–24; note v. 24a: *man's reaction to God's greatness*—cf. 36,24–25).

5.3 Transition markers

5.3.1 IN THE FIRST LINE OF THE STROPHE

5.3.1.1 imperative: *ktr*, 36,2a
hn, v. 5a
w- beginn. line, v. 8a; ext. // *w*- beginn. line in vv. 9a and 10a
w- beginning line, v. 13a
ḥnp, v. 13a
w- beginn. line, v. 16a; ext. // *w*- beginn. line in v. 17a
h- interr., v. 19a
hn, v. 22a
my, v. 22b; ext. // *my* in vv. 23a and b
imperative: *zkr*, v. 24a
hn, v. 26a
hn, v. 30a
z't, 37,1a
imperative: *šm'w*, v. 2a
paronom. inf. constr.: *šm'w šmw'*, v. 2a
w- beginning line, v. 8a
imperative: *h'zynh*, v. 14a
z't, v.14a
vocative: *'ywb*, v. 14a
imperative: *'md*, v. 14b
imperative: *htbwnn*, v. 14b
h- interr., v. 15a; ext. // *h*-interr. in v. 16a

imperat.: *hwdy‘nw*, v. 19a
mh, v. 19a
w- beginning line, v. 21a
‘th, v. 21a
hw’, v. 21b

5.3.1.2 *’p*, v. 16a

’p, 37,1a
’mr, v. 6a
’p, v. 11a

5.3.2 IN THE LAST LINE OF THE STROPHE

5.3.2.1 *lnṣḥ*, 36,7c
’mr, v. 10b
’l (prohib.), v. 18b
’l (prohib.), v. 21a; ext.
// *’l* (prohib.) in v. 20a
zh, v. 21b
’mr, v. 23b
’p, v. 29a
’p, v. 33b (?)

’mr, 37,20b; ext. // *’mr* in
v. 19a

5.3.2.2 *’mnm*, 36,4a
w- beginning line, v. 12a
imperative: *hšmr*, v. 21a
’nwš, v. 25b

h- interr., 37,20a
lkn, v. 24a

5.3.3 CONTRARY INDICATIONS

rš‘, 36,6a
rš‘, 36,17a
w- beginning line, 37,12a
h’w, 37,12a

5.4 Verbal repetitions in strophic perspective—an outline

5.4.1 WITHIN THE STROPHES

36,2–4: *ky*, vv. 2b.4a—inclusio
mlh, vv. 2b.4a!—inclusio
yd‘, vv. 3a.4b
vv. 5–7: *l’*, vv. 6a.7a—exactly linear; see also *l’* in v. 5a
‘nyym/*‘ynyw*, vv. 6b and 7a resp.—alliteration
vv. 8–10: *w-*, vv. 8a.9a.10a—exactly linear
’swrym/*lmwsr*, vv. 8a and 10a resp. (alliteration)—inclusio
wygd/*wygl*, vv. 9a and 10a resp. (alliter.)—exactly linear
pš‘/*’wn*, vv. 9b and 10b resp.
ky, vv. 9b.10b
vv. 11–12: *’m*, vv. 11a.12a

yšm‘w, vv. 11a.12a
wy‘bdw/y‘brw, vv. 11a and 12b resp.–alliteration
b-, vv. 11b+c.12b+c*
vv. 13–15: *-m*, vv. 13b.15b—exactly linear (incl.); see also *bqdšym* in v. 14b
vv. 16–18: *swt*, vv. 16a.18a!—inclusio
ml’, vv. 16c.17a!
vv. 19–21: *’l* (prohib.), vv. 20a.21a
‘mym/m‘ny, vv. 20b and 21b resp.—alliteration
vv. 22–23: *my*, vv. 22b.23a+b
vv. 24–25: *’nšym/’nwš*, vv. 24b and 25b resp.
vv. 26–27: *wl’ nd‘/l’dw*, vv. 26a and 27b resp.—alliteration
vv. 32–33: *‘l . . . ‘lyh/‘lyw . . . l‘wlh*, vv. 32 and 33 resp.—alliteration

37,4–5: *qwl*, vv. 4a+b+c.5b
yr‘m, vv. 4b.5a!
wl’, vv. 4c.5b
vv. 8–10: *wtb’/tbw’*, vv. 8a and 9a resp.
mn, vv. 9a.10a—exactly linear; see also *mn* in v. 9b
qrh/qrḥ, vv. 9b and 10a resp.—alliteration
vv. 12c–13: *’rṣh/l’ rṣw*, vv. 12d and 13a resp.—alliteration
vv. 15–16: *htd‘*, vv. 15a.16a—exactly linear; see also *yd‘* in v. 16b
‘l, vv. 15a.16a
vv. 17–18: *ḥmym bhšqṭ/lšḥqym ḥzqym*, vv. 17 and 18 resp.—alliter.
vv. 19–20: *’mr*, vv. 19a.20b
vv. 21–22: *l’ r’w ’wr/’lwh nwr’*, vv. 21a and 22b resp.—alliteration
vv. 23–24: *l’*, vv. 23a+b.24b
kḥ/ḥkmy, vv. 23a and 24b resp.—alliteration

5.4.2 WITHIN THE CANTICLES

vv. 30–33 (II.1.2): *‘lyw*, vv. 30a.33a—inclusio
’wr, vv. 30a.32a—linear
ksh, vv. 30b.32a!—linear
vv. 1–5 (II.2.1): *šm‘*, vv. 2a (2×).4c—linear
qwl, vv. 2a.4–5!

5.4.3 WITHIN THE SUB-CANTOS

36,5–12 (I.1): *‘nh*, vv. 6b.8b
wyšybm/yšbwn, vv. 7c and 10b resp. (alliter.)—linear
w’m, vv. 8a.12a; see also *’m* in v. 11a

36,13–21 (I.2): *’p/’p*, vv. 13a and 16a resp. (alliteration)—linear
‘nh, vv. 15a (2×).21b
ṣr, vv. 16a.19a!—exactly linear
tḥt, vv. 16b.20b
ky, vv. 18a.21b—linear
’l (prohib.), vv. 18b.21a—linear; see also v. 20a

36,22–25 (I.3): *yśgyb/tśgy’*, vv. 22a and 24a resp. (alliter.)—linear
-w, vv. 22a.23a.24a.25a—exactly linear; see also *-w* in v. 23a
p‘l, vv. 23b.24a—concatenatio

36,26–33 (II.1): *hn* ... *ky*, vv. 26–27.30–31—exactly linear
’d/šršy hym, vv. 27b and 30b resp.—linear
’p/’p, vv. 29a and 33b resp. (alliter.)—linear
prś, vv. 29a.30a!—concatenatio

37,1–10 (II.2): *kl*, vv. 3a.7a+b
’rṣ, vv. 3b.6a
’l (‘God’), vv. 5a.10a—exactly linear
‘śh, vv. 5b.7b
yd‘, vv. 5b.7b

37,14–20 (III.1): *n/mpl’wt*, vv. 14b.16b
yd‘, vv. 15a+16a+b.19a

37,21–24 (III.2): *l’ r’h/l’ yr’h*, vv. 21a and 24b resp.!—inclusio
yr’, vv. 22b.24a!—linear

5.4.4 WITHIN THE CANTOS

36,5–22 (canto I): *hn ’l kbyr/hn ’l yśgyb*, vv. 5a and 22a resp. —exactly linear
kḥ, vv. 5b.22a—linear; see also v. 19b
lb, vv. 5b.13a—linear
ḥyh, vv. 6a.14b—linear
rš‘, vv. 6a.17a!
wmšpṭ, vv. 6b.17b
‘nh, vv. 6b+8b.15a+21b!
’sr, vv. 8a.13b!
p‘l, vv. 9a.23b+24a
wygl (...) *’znm*, vv. 10a.15b!

kl, vv. 19b.25a—linear
mn, vv. 21b.25b—linear

36,26–37,13 (canto II): *wl’ nd‘*, 36,26a.37,5b!—linear
’šr, 36,28a.37,12c—linear
‘b, 36,29a.37,11a—linear
ytn, 36,31b.37,10a—linear
kp/yd, 36,32a and 37,7a resp.—linear
ṣwh, 36,32b.37,12c!
’p/’p, 36,33b and 37,1a resp.–concatenatio
’p, 37,1a.11a—exactly linear

37,14–24 (canto III): *’lwh*, vv. 15a.22b—‘linear’; see also *’l* in v. 14b
šḥqym, vv. 18a.21b

5.4.5 WITHIN THE COMPOSITION AS A WHOLE

36,2–4.22–25.37,11–13.21–24: *mrḥwq*, 36,3a.25b!—linear
p‘l, 36,3b.23b+24a.37,12b
śg‘, 36,24a.37,23b—linear; cf. also 36,26a!
’nšym, 36,24b.37,24a—linear; see also *’nwš* in 36,25b
kl, 36,25a.37,12c.24b—linear
ḥzh … nbṭ/r’h, 36,25 and 37,21a+24a resp.
’wr, 37,11b.21a—linear
mṣ’ + suff. *-hw*, 37,13b.23a!—linear

36,2–4.5–12, ‘concat.’: *yd‘*, vv. 3a+4b.12c
ntn, vv. 3b.6b
ṣdq, vv. 3b.7a

36,5–7.37,23–24, inclusio: *kḥ*, 36,5b.37,23a
lb, 36,5b.37,24b
wmšpṭ, 36,6b.37,23b; however, see also v. 17b!
ṣdq, 36,7a.37,23b; see also v. 3b!

36,5–12.26–33.37,14–20: *hn ’l kbyr/śgy’ wl’*, 36,5a.26a!—exactly linear; see also *’l* (‘God’) in 37,14b, *kbyr* in 36,5b and *wl’* in 36,26b

(m)kbyr, 36,5a+b.31b!
ytn, 36,6b.31b
ygr‘, 36,7a.27a!—exactly linear
ngd hiph‘il, 36,9a.33a!
’zn, 36,10a.37,14a
šny, 36,11c.26b!
byn, 36,29a.37,14b!—‘linear’
‘b, 36,29a.37,16a—‘linear’

36,13–21.37,1–10.14–20: *lb*, 36,13a.37,1a—linear
’p/*’p*, 36,13a and 37,1a resp. (alliter.)—linear
’zn, 36,15b.37,14a
rḥb ... *mwṣq*, 36,16a.37,10b!; see also *mwṣq* in 37,18b!
tḥt, 36,16b+20b.37,3a
h- interr., 36,19a.37,20a—linear; see also vv. 15–16!
‘rk, 36,19a.37,19b!—linear
lylh/*ḥšk*, 36,20a and 37,19b resp.—linear
’l (prohib.) ... *’l* (prep.)/*’l* (‘God’), 36,21a and 37,10a resp.—alliteration; see also *’l* (prohib.) in 36,20a and *’l* (‘God’) in 37,5a and 14a
pnh, 36,21a.37,19b—linear
ky, 36,21b.37,20a+b—linear; see also *ky* in 36,18a and 37,6a
mn, 36,21b.37,9a+10a.19b—linear
npl’wt, 37,5a.14b+16b (*mpl’wt*)!

See also *z’t* in 37,1a.14a (beginning sub-canto)

5.5 Different divisions

Köster (1831): 36,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12.13–15|16–19.20–21.22–25.26–29.30–33|37,1–5.6–10.11–13.14–18.19–23.24 (3×3.2.3|4.2.3×4|5.5.3.5.5.1)
Stickel (1842): 36,2–4.5–7|8–12.13–17|18–21.22–25.26–29.30–33|37,1–5.6–10|11–13.14–16|17–20.21–24 (3.3|5.5|4×4|5.5|3.3|4.4)
Schlottmann (1851): 36,2–4||5–7.8–12(=8–10.11–12)|13–15.16–21(=16–17.18–19.20–21)||22–25.26–29.30–33|37,1–4.5–8.9–13|14–17.18–20.21–24 (3||3.5(=3.2)|3.6(=2.2.2)||3×4|4.4.5|4.3.4; 3|8.9|12.13.11)
Ewald (1854): 36,2–4.5–25.26–37,24

Delitzsch (1876): 36,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12.13–15.16–18.19–21.22–25.26–29.30 33|37,1–5.6–10.11–13.14–16.17–20.21–24 (6.7.3×6.7.6.3×8|11.11.8.6.8.11)

Wright (1883): 36,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12|13–14.15–17.18–21.22–25.26–29|30–33.37,1–5.6–10.11–13|14–15.16–20.21–24 (5.7.6.6|4.7.8.8.8|8.10.10.8|4.10.10)

Dillmann (1891): 36,2–4 5–7.8–12.13–15|16–25||26–37,13|14–20.21–24

Bickell (1894): 36,2–3.4–5a+6a.12+14.15+6b+7a.18–19.21a+22b–23.24+27a+28a.33–37,1.5b–6a+7.8–9.11a+12.14–15.16–17.19–20.21a–b+22b+23a.23b+24

Ley (1895): 36,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12.13–15.16–19.20–21.22–25.26–29.30–33|37,1–5.6–10.11–14.15–18.19–22.23–24 (3×3.2.3.4.2.3×4|3×5.4.4.2)

Duhm (1897): 36,2–21; 36,22–37,24

Vetter (1897): 36,2–4.5–7.8–14(=8–11.12–14).15–19(=15–16.17–19).20–21.22–25.26–29.30–32.33–37,4(=33–37,1.2–4).5–10(=5–6.7–8.9–10).11–13.14–18(=14–16.17–18).19–20.21–22.23–24

Hontheim (1904): 36,2–4|5–7||8–15||16–18|19–21||22–25.27–28+31+26||37,5b–10|1–5a||36,29–30+32–33.37,11–13||14–19|20–24 (3.3|8|3.3|8|5.5|8|6.6)

Schlögl (1916): 36,2–12.13–22.23–33.37,1–11.14–16a+17–24 (5×22)

Peters (1928): 36,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12.13–14.15–16.17–19.20–21.22–23.24–26 (3×3.3×2.3.2.2.3); 36,27–28.29–30.31–32.33–37,1.2–3.4–5.6–8.9–11.12–13 (6×2.3×3); 37,14–16.17–18.19–20.21–22a.22b–24 (3.3×2.3)

König (1929): 36,2–4.5–15.16–25.26–37,13.14–20.21–24

Kissane (1939): 36,2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12.13–15.16*–17+21.18–20 (7×3); 22–25.26–28+31.29–30+32–33.37,1–4.5–8.21–22+9–10.11–13 (7×4); 14–18.19–20+22b–24 (5.5)

RSV (1952): 36,2–4.5–12.13–16.17–23.24–33.37,1–13.14–20.21–24

Möller (1955): 36,2–4.5–15.16–23.24–37,5.6–13.14–24 (3.11.8.15.8.11)

Fohrer (1963): …|36,5–10.11a b+12–15|16–21*.22–26 (…|6.5|7.5); 27–28.29–30.31–32.33–37,1.2–3.4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12b.12c–13 (11×2); 14–18.19–21b+22–23* (5.5)

Terrien (1963): 36,2–4.5–7a|7b–10.11–12|13–15.16–17|19–21.22–25; 36,26–28.29–30|31–33.37,1–3||4–5.6–8|9–10.11–13|14–16.17–18|19–20.21–24

NAB (1970): 36,2–4.5–7.8–12.13–15+21–25.26–33.37,1–4b.5–13.14–18.19–21.22–24

TOB (1978): 36,2–4.5–15|16–21.22–25|26–33|37,1.2–5.6–13|14–18.19–20.21–24

De Wilde (1981): 36,2–4.5a+6–7a.7b–8.9–10.11a–b+12.13–14.15–16a.

16b–17.18–19.20–21.22–23.24–25; 26+29.30+27.28+31.32–33.37,1.
2–3.4.5–6.7–8.9–10.11–12b.12c–13.14.15+17.16+18.19–20|21–22a.
22b–23.24

Van Selms (1983): 36,2–7.8–15.16–23.24–33.37,1–13.14–24

Rozelaar (1984): 36,2–7.8–14.15–21.22–25.26–33.37,1–13.14–18.19–20.
21–24

Webster (1984), pp. 104–05: 36,2–3.4–7.8–12.13–16.17–21 (5 strophes);
22–25.26–29.30–33|37,1–4.5–8.9–13|14–17.18–21.22–24 (3×3 = 9
strophes)

Habel (1985): 36,2–7(=2–4.5–7).8–15|16–21.22–25.26–33.37,1–13|14–22.
23–24 (a.b.c|a'.b'.c'.c''|a''.b'')

Hartley (1988): 36,2–4|5–15.16–25|26–37,13.14–20|21–24

Wahl (1993): 36,2–4|5–7.8–11.12–15|16–21|22–25.26–33.37,1–5.6–13|
14–20|21–24

PART VI

Systematic Observations
or
an Introduction to
the Design of Biblical Poetry

1 The macrostructure of the poems

1.1 General outline

The systematic observations on the poetic structures of the compositions analysed in the previous parts (parts II–V) are preceded in this section by a general outline of the structural macromanifestations of the poems. In brief, this survey provides an overview of all the macrostructures of the poems in the book of Job. It will make it easier to draw some general conclusions, in the first place about the structure of the poetry in the book of Job, and presumably about the structure of Hebrew poetry in general as well. Moreover, this survey will help the reader to verify the observations of the systematic approach immediately.

In this general outline the number of the chapter(s) is followed by a *siglum* within brackets for the name of the speaker (J=Job; Eph=Eliphaz; B=Bildad; Z=Zophar; Gd=God; Ehu=Elihu).[1] Then follows a formalized scheme to denote the length of the cantos, the canticles (if applicable), and the strophes of the poem in the familiar codes (the figures represent the number of the lines in the respective units; cf. analyses x.5 in parts II–V).

---

[1] The *siglum* Ehu does not occur in this section, but in the next—in which I use the same codes—it does.

After having presented the formalized descriptions of a complete speech-cycle I note the masoretic verse-divisions of the respective poems corresponding with the 'strophic' structure. In the few cases where one masoretic verse represents two poetic verse-lines the number of the verse is printed in bold face.

JOB 3 AND THE FIRST SPEECH-CYCLE

3 (J) — 8.9.7 > 1.3.3.1|3.3.3|4.3

4 (Eph) — 10.10 > 5.5|5.5 > 3.2|3.2||3.2|3.2
5 (Eph) — 7.9.10 1 > 5.2|7.2|7.3 1 > 1.2.2|2||1.3.3|2||1.3.3|3 1
6 (J) — 12.10.7 > 6.6|7.3|7 > 3.3|3.3||1.3.3|3||1.3|3
7 (J) — 8.8.7 > 4.4|4.4|3.4 > 2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.1|2.2
8 (B) — 6.6.6.3 > 3.3|3.3|3.3|3
9 (J) — 11.12.11 > 11|6.6|11 > 3.3.3.2||2.2.2|2.2.2||2.3.3.3
10 (J) — 2 10.10 > 2 5.5|5.5 > 2 3.2|2.3||3.2|2.3
11 (Z) — 6.6.6.2 > 3.3|3.3|3.3|2
12 (J) — 12.12 > 5.7|7.5 > 2.3|2.2.3||3.2.2|2.3
13 (J) — 4.12.12 > 4|4.4.4|4.4.4 > 2.2||2.2|2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2|2.2
14 (J) — 12.10 > 6.6|5.5 > 3.3|3.3||3.2|2.3

3 (J) — vv. 3.4–6.7–9.10||11–12+16.13–15.17–19||20–23.24–26

4 (Eph) — vv. 2–4.5–6|7–9.10–11||12–14.15–16|17–19.20–21
5 (Eph) — vv. 1.2–3.4–5|6–7||8.9–11.12–14|15–16||17.18–20.21–23|24–26 27
6 (J) — vv. 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13||14.15–17.18–20||21–23||24.25–27|28–30
7 (J) — vv. 1–2.3–4|5–6.7–8||9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16||17–18.19|**20.21**
8 (B) — vv. 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13|14–16.17–19|20–22
9 (J) — vv. 2–4.5–7.8–10.11–12||13–14.15–16.17–18|19–20.21–22.23–24||25–26.27–29.30–32.33–35
10 (J) — vv. 1–2 3–5.6–7|8–9.10–12||13–15.16–17|18–19.20–22
11 (Z) — vv. 2–4.5–**6**|7–9.10–12|13–15.16–18|19–20
12 (J) — vv. 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–10.11–13||14–16.17–18.19–20|21–22.23–25
13 (J) — vv. 1–2.3–4||5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16||17–18.19–20|21–22.23–24|25–26.27–28
14 (J) — vv. 1–3.4–6|7–9.10–12||13–15.16–17|18–19.20–22

THE SECOND SPEECH-CYCLE AND JOB 40,1–5

15 (Eph) — 5.5.5 > 2.3|2.3|2.3
15 (Eph) — 3 8.8 > 3 4.4|4.4 > 3 2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2
16–17 (J) — 6 16.16 > 6 8.4.4|5.5.6 > 3.3 2.3.3|2.2|2.2||2.3|2.3|2.2.2
18 (B) — 3 6.6.5 > 3 3.3|3.3|3.2
19 (J) — 4 14.10 > 4 7.7|5.5 > 2.2 3.2.2|3.2.2||3.2|3.2
20 (Z) — 2 8.8.10 > 2 8|8|4.6 > 2 3.3.2||3.3.2||2.2|3.3
21 (J) — 3 11.11.7 1 > 3 3.3.3.2|3.3.3.2|2.2.3 1
22 (Eph) — 10.9.10 > 10|9|5.5 > 2.2.2.2.2||1.2.2.2.2|3.2|3.2
23 (J) — 1 5.5.5 > 1 2.3|2.3|2.3
24 (B) — 13.13 > 7.6|6.7 > 1.3.3|3.3||2.2.2|2.2.2.1
25–26 (J) — 8.9 1 > 2.3.3|3.3.3 1

40,2 (Gd) — > 1
40,4–5 (J) — > 2

15 (Eph) — vv. 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–11|12–13.14–16
15 (Eph) — vv. 17–19 20–21.22–23|24–25.26–27||28–29.30–31|32–33.34–35
16–17 (J) — vv. 2–4b.4c–6 7–8.9–11.12–14|15–16.17–18|19–20.21–22||1–2.3–5|6–7.8–10|11–12.13–14.15–16
18 (B) — vv. 2–4 5–7.8–10|11–13.14–16|17–19.20–21
19 (J) — vv. 2–3.4–5 6–8.9–10.11–12|13–15.16–17.18–19||20–22.23–24|25–27.28–29
20 (Z) — vv. 2–3 4–6.7–9.10–11||12–14.15–17.18–19||20–21.22–23|24–26.27–29
21 (J) — vv. 2–4 5–7.8–10.11–13.14–15|16–18.19–21.22–24.25–26|27–28.29–30.31–33 34
22 (Eph) — vv. 2–3.4–5.6–7.8–9.10–11||12.13–14.15–16.17–18.19–20||21–23.24–25|26–28.29–30
23 (J) — vv. 2 3–4.5–7|8–9.10–12|13–14.15–17
24 (B) — vv. 1.2–4.5–6|7–9.10–12||13–14.15–16.17–18|19–20.21–22.23–24.25
25–26 (J) — vv. 2–3.4–6.2–4|5–7.8–10.11–13 14

40,2 (Gd) — vv. 2
40,4–5 (J) — vv. 4–5

THE THIRD SPEECH-CYCLE AND JOB 42,1–6

27 (J) — 12.10 > 6.6|10 > 3.3|3.3||2.2.2.2.2
28 (J) — 4.8.8.8 > 4|4.4|4.4|4.4 > 2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2
29 (J) — 9.8.7 > 5.4|4.4|2.5 > 2.3|2.2||2.2|2.2||2|2.3
30 (J) — 9.8.8.8 > 9|4.4|4.4|4.4 > 3.3.3||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2
31 (J) — 12.16.12 > 6.6|6.5.5|6.6 > 2.2.2|2.2.2||3.3|3.2|3.2||2.2.2|3.3
38,2–38 (Gd) — 2 12.12.11 > 2 4.4.4|6.6|5.6 > 2 2.2|2.2|2.2||3.3|3.3||3.2|3.3
38,39–39,30 (Gd) — 15.13.5 > 7.8|6.7|5 > 3|2.2||2.2|2.2|||3.3||2.3.2|||3.2
40,7–41,26 (Gd) — 8.22.23 > 8|11.11|6.8.9 > 3.3.2||4.4.3|4.4.3||3.3|4.4|4.3.2

40,2–6 (J) — > 3.3

27 (J) — vv. 2–4.5–7|8–10.11–13||14–15.16–17.18–19.20–21.22–23
28 (J) — vv. 1–2.3–4||5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12||13–14.15–16|17–18.19–20||21–22.23–24|25–26.27–28
29 (J) — vv. 2–3.4–6|7–8.9–10||11–12.13–14|15–16.17–18||19–20|21–22.23–25
30 (J) — vv. **1**–3a.3b–5.6–8||9–10.11–12b|12c–13.14–15||16–17.18–19|20–21.22–23||24–25.26–27|28–29.30–31
31 (J) — 1–2.3–4.5–6|7–8.9–10.11–12||13–15.16–18|19–21.22–23|24–26.27–28||29–30.31–32.33–34|35–37.38–40
38,2–38 (Gd) — vv. 2–3 4–5.6–7|8–9.10–11|12–13.14–15||16–18.19–21|22–24.25–27||28–30.31–32|33–35.36–38
38,39–39,30 (Gd) — vv. 39–41|1–2.3–4||5–6.7–8|9–10.11–12|||13–15.16–18||19–20.21–23.24–25|||26–28.29–30
40,7–41,26 (Gd) — vv. 7–9.10–12.13–14||15–18.19–22.**23**–24|25–28.29–32.1–3||4–6.7–9|10–13.14–17|18–21.22–24.25–26

40,2–6 (J) — vv. 2–3.4–6

THE ELIHU-SPEECHES

32 — 9.9 > 3.3.3|3.3.3
33 — 7.11.12 3 > 3.4|4.4.3|4.4.4 3 > 3|2.2||2.2|2.2|3||2.2|2.2|2.2 3
34 — 14.15.7 > 8.6|7.8|7 > 2.3.3|3.3||3.2.2|2.2.2.2||3.2.2
35 — 7.8 > 3.4|4.4 > 2.1|2.2||2.2|2.2
36–37 — 3 21.22.11 > 3 8.9.4|8.10.4|7.4 > 3 3.3.2||3.3.3||2.2|||2.2|2.2||1.2.2|2.3||2.2|||1.2.2.2||2.2

32 — vv. **6**–7.8–10.11–13|14–16.17–19.20–22
33 — vv. 1–3|4–5.6–7||8–9.10–11|12–13.14–15|16–18||19–20.21–22|23–24.25–26|27–28.29–30 31–33
34 — vv. 2–3.4–6.7–9|10–12.13–15||16–18.19–20.21–22|23–24.25–26.27–28.29–30||31–33.34–35.36–37
35 — vv. 2–3.4|5–6.7–8||9–10.11–12|13–14.15–16
36–37 — vv. 2–4 5–7.8–10.11–12||13–15.16–18.19 21||22–23.24–25|||26–27.28–29|30–31.32–33||1.2–3.4–5|6–7.8–10||11–12b.12c–13|||14.15–16.17–18.19–20||21–22.23–24

1.2 Systematic approach

At first sight the above general outline might create the impression that the Hebrew poets shaped their compositions in a rather loose way. To a certain degree this observation is correct. That is to say, with regard to the level of the strophes it would oversimplify the facts to state that the Hebrew poets always shaped their compositions according to a rigid pattern consisting of an unbroken series of strophes with an identical number of lines, e.g., 3.3.3.3, or 2.2.2.2. This statement would often be incorrect with regard to the length of successive strophes within one and the same poem. See, e.g., Job 5,8–16 with its strophic scheme 1.3.3.2.

Nevertheless, we are positively able to detect some pattern, a degree of regularity or—as the case may be—consistency in the build up of the speeches in the book of Job. If we only took into consideration the sequence of the strophes within a poem we would get a very one-sided impression of its macrostructure. Because strophes are always grouped into cantos and—where applicable—into canticles, one would get an incomplete picture of this macrostructure. At this point I can make a connection with an important conclusion which emerged from my inquiry into the macrostructures of the psalms. That investigation led to the conclusion that the main regularity in the macrostructure of a Hebrew poem is not so much to be looked for on the level of the strophes, but rather on that of the cantos and the canticles.[2] This conclusion has clearly been substantiated in the course of my analyis of the poems in the book of Job.

1.2.1 DESIGN ON THE LEVEL OF THE CANTOS

When we look at the structural schemes of the poems analysed above in parts II–V from the perspective of the cantos (and the canticles), a certain degree of regularity is unmistakable. Generally speaking, every poem is constructed on a basic pattern of two or three identical, or almost identical cantos. Only in ch. 30 did we come across a poem built up of *four* almost identical cantos. By identical cantos I understand a sequence of major units with an equal number of verse-lines.[3] By 'almost identical' cantos I understand a sequence of major units which differ in length by generally not more than one line.[4] When one is dealing with cantos of some length, as a rule ten or more lines, this discrepancy can increase to two or even four lines (chs. 19 and 31). In poems which are constructed on a framework of three almost identical cantos, these units sometimes display a concentric pattern; see chs. 9 22 31. In the overview below the schemes of these poems are underlined.[5] The subdivisions in canticles and strophes of the almost identical cantos sometimes prove that the disproportionate length of these main units is not due to scribal errors, but reflects rather a quite deliberate technique of the Hebrew poets. In ch. 9, e.g., the symmetric pattern is also discernable in the sequence of the canticles and the strophes. In ch. 14 the cantos have a very regular pattern on the level of the canticles. And in ch. 19 the cantos not only display a very regular pattern on the canticle level, but on that of the strophes as well. The same is true for chs. 27 and 30.

---

[2] STR, p. 478. This regularity emerges when we take into consideration the number of the verse-lines of the cantos (stanzas) and the canticles (substanzas). The 'Kampen School' takes for granted that especially the number of the strophes is constitutive for the length of a canticle or 'subcanto', rather than the number of the verse-lines. See Korpel and De Moor (1988), pp. 44, 47, 53, 54 (!), otherwise p. 56; W.T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTS 93), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990, pp. 227–28; J. Kim, *The Structure of the Samson Cycle*, Kampen: Kok, 1993, pp. 324 and 385. Nevertheless, according to Koopmans there is also a close uniformity of total verses, and even cola in Joshua 24.

[3] These lines usually consist of two cola. This 'regular' length, however, is sometimes interrupted by tricola. On this phenomenon see section 2 below.

[4] Cf. Korpel and De Moor (1988), pp. 36–44 about 'expansion' and 'contraction'.

[5] A relatively small group of poems shows such a concentric pattern; cf. also ch. 12 (see below, section 1.2.4). This observation matches my conclusions about the macrostructures of the psalms; see STR, p. 482. In the psalms with a concentric pattern the pivotal canto is mostly longer than the framing units: e.g., 3.6.3 (Ps. 41), 2.4.2 (Ps. 67), 4.8.4 (Ps. 79), 6.7.6 (Ps. 90); cf. Job 9 and 31. See further in this connection Isa. 42,1–12 (5.7.5 > 3.2|2.3.2|2.3), Prov. 5 (6.8.6 3 > 3.3|2.2.2.2|3.3 3). In Pss. 72 and 145, as far as canto-length is concerned, the concentric scheme is reversed: 8.4.8 and 9.4.8 1 resp.; cf. Job 22. However, we come across some fine examples of this inverted concentric scheme in Trito-Isa.: 4.2.4 (Isa. 57,14–20), 12.8.12 (Isa. 58), 15.6.16 (the framing cantos are almost identical; Isa. 59); see also S. of S. 4,8–5,1 (6.4.6 > 3.3|2.2|3.3).

The basic pattern is frequently expanded by a unit which—in view of its length—usually has no relationship with the cantos of the basic pattern of a given poem. This unit always amounts to exactly seven lines. In the overviews below the figures which represent these cantos are printed in bold face. Furthermore, we can single out a group of poems with a basic scheme 4.4.2 or 2.4.4. That is to say, the identical (or almost identical) cantos of these poems are followed or preceded by a unit which comprises only half the number of the lines of the 'identical' cantos.

Finally, all the patterns described above can be expanded by 'small' strophes introducing and/or concluding a poem. This unit can comprise one to six lines (see, e.g., 5,27 and 16,2–6). In the analyses of parts II–V these elements are indicated as A (at the beginning of a poem) and B (at the end of a poem). In the codes of the formalized schemes there is no dot between the unit in question and the following or preceding main body of the poem (see, e.g., the opening unit in ch. 10: 2 10.10).

Thus, the Hebrew poets (of the book of Job) very creatively utilized the basic pattern of two, three or more (almost) identical cantos, by which they shaped the main body of their compositions. They endlessly varied it, with the result that—already from the perspective of the build up by cantos—hardly two Hebrew poems of any length show exactly the same design.

Considering the poems in the book of Job from the perspective of their macrostructure, as described above, we can formulate the following systematic overviews.

IDENTICAL CANTOS

	5.5.5		(15,2–16; Eph, II)
1	5.5.5		(23; J, II)
	6.6.6.3		(8; B, I)
	6.6.6.2		(11; Z, I)
	8.8.**7**		(7; J, I)
3	8.8		(15,17–35; Eph, II)
	4.8.8.8		(28; J, III)
	9.9		(32; Eh, IV)
	10.10		(4; Eph, I)
2	10.10		(10; J, I)
3	11.11.**7**	1	(21; J, II)
	12.12		(12; J, I)
	4.12.12		(13; J, I)
	13.13		(24; B, II)
6	16.16		(16–17; J, II)

ALMOST IDENTICAL CANTOS

3	6.6.5		(18; B, II)		12.10.**7**		(6; J, I)
	7.8		(35; Ehu, IV)		**7**.11.12	3	(33; Ehu, IV)
2	8.8.10		(20; Z, II)		11.12.11		(9; J, I)
	8.9	1	(25–26; J, II)	2	12.12.11		(38; Gd, III)
	8.9.**7**		(3; J)		12.16.12		(31; J, III)
	9.8.**7**		(29; J, III)	4	14.10		(19; J, II)
	9.8.8.8		(30; J, III)		15.13.5		(39; Gd, III)
	7.9.10	1	(5; Eph, I)		14.15.**7**		(34; Ehu, IV)
	10.9.10		(22; Eph, II)	3	21.22.11		(36–37; Ehu, IV)
	12.10		(14; J, I)		8.22.23		(40–41; Gd, III)
	12.10		(27; J, III)				

1.2.2 THE SEVEN-LINE CANTO IN THE DESIGN OF THE POEMS

In eight poems we come across a 7-line canto which in view of its length has no relationship with the identical or almost identical cantos of the compositions studied. This is the case with the following canto schemes:

8.9.**7**		(3; J)	3	11.11.**7**	1	(21; J, II)
7.9.10	1	(5; Eph, I)		9.8.**7**		(29; J, II)
12.10.**7**		(6; J, I)		**7**.11.12	3	(33; Ehu, IV)
8.8.**7**		(7; J, I)		14.15.**7**		(34; Ehu, IV)

In six poems this 7-line canto follows the identical or almost identical cantos. Only two times does this anomalous canto precede the 'identical' cantos, chs. 5 (Eph) and 33 (Ehu).[6] It is striking that the 7-line canto often occurs in the speeches by Job (5×) and in these cases always follows the 'identical' cantos.[7]

Next, we find that this 7-line canto, apart from its total length, occupies no particular position within the macrostructure of the poems. It can be established that this canto is as integrated in the overall structure of the poems as are the other cantos. That is to say, from a formal point of view—the verbal repetitions—the anomalous canto does not contrast with the others. When we take into consideration the strophic structure of the 7-line canto we can point, in some instances, to a relationship between it and the 'identical' cantos. This is true for 6,24–30 with the strophic structure 1.3.3 (cf. 6,14–20) and 34,31–37 with the strophic structure 3.2.2 (cf. 34,16–22).

---

[6] See also two examples from Trito-Isa. with a *7-line unit following* two 'identical' cantos: 16.18.7 (Isa. 60) and 10.10.7 (Isa. 62)!

[7] This is why I take the 7-line canto in ch. 7 as an anomalous canto and not as an 'almost identical' canto; see in this context also chs. 3 and 29.

When we leave the Elihu-speeches out of consideration the same applies to the 7-line canto from a thematic point of view. This canto thus forms an indispensable part in the development of the thought-content of the speeches concerned. In this respect the anomalous canto distinguishes itself from the opening or closing units described below (see section 1.2.6).

As regards my last point, the Elihu-speeches are an exception to this rule. In ch. 33 the opening canto with seven lines is obviously meant as an introduction to the argument Elihu will develop in the second canto. Similarly, the seven-line canto of ch. 34 functions from a thematic point of view as a conclusion to the argument in the foregoing canto(s). In this respect the anomalous cantos in the Elihu-speeches resemble the opening and closing units described below (section 1.2.6). From a formal point of view—the verbal repetitions—the 7-line cantos in the Elihu-speeches are nonetheless as integrated in their respective poems as the corresponding cantos in the first three speech-cycles.

1.2.3 THE 4.4.2 AND 2.4.4 CANTO DESIGN

There are seven poems in the book of Job which we may reduce to another common basic scheme. This scheme can be defined as follows: the identical (or almost identical) cantos are followed or preceded by a canto which contains not more than half the number of lines of the identical (or almost identical) cantos. This 'half-long' unit may even be shorter than half the number of lines of the 'identical' cantos (see, e.g., ch. 13: 4.12.12), but not longer. To this group I reckon the following poems (the 'half-long' cantos are printed in bold face):

6.6.6.**3**	(8; B, I)
6.6.6.**2**	(11; Z, I)
4.8.8.8	(28; J, III)
4.12.12	(13; J, I)
15.13.**5**	(39; Gd, III)
3 21.22.**11**	(36–37; Ehu, IV)
8.22.23	(40–41; Gd, III)

Four times the half-long canto follows the identical cantos while three times it precedes these.[8]

From the perspective of the verbal repetitions the half-long cantos are always completely integrated into the overall structure of the poems. With regard to the thought-content the opening cantos always represent a preparation for the theme of the poem, i.e. they provide an indication concerning the leading idea of the following cantos. Note the opening lines of the poems in question:

---

[8] In the psalms I came across the basic patterns 4.4.2 and 2.4.4, too. The former pattern (4.4.2), with the anomalous unit following the identical cantos, occurs much more frequently (27×) than the latter pattern (2.4.4), with the anomalous canto preceding the identical cantos (11×; ratio 2.5:1). See STR, pp. 479 and 483–84.

> *ky yš lksp mwṣ’ // wmqwm lzhb yzqw* (28,1; J);
>
> *’zr n’ kgbr ḥlṣyk // ’š’lk whwdy‘ny* (40,7; Gd).[9]

The same is true for 13,1–4; note especially vv. 3–4 (J; see part II, 12).

The closing units in the speeches of Bildad (ch. 8), Zophar (ch. 11), Elihu (chs. 36–37) and God (ch. 39) function as a summary of the preceding argument (see the analyses in parts II, IV and V).

1.2.4 DESIGN ON THE LEVEL OF THE CANTICLES

Usually the cantos fall into subunits, which themselves encompass two or more strophes. I called these units ‘canticles’. It appears that the divisions of the cantos into canticles in the majority of the poems also display distinct patterns. Naturally, this framework is most apparent in those instances where two or three identical cantos fall into two or three identical canticles. This is the case in the following instances:

10.10	> 5.5|5.5	(4; Eph, I)
8.8	> 4.4|4.4	(7,1–16; J, I)
10.10	> 5.5|5.5	(10,3–22; J, I)
12.12	> 4.4.4|4.4.4	(13,5–28; J, I)
8.8	> 4.4|4.4	(15,20–35; Eph, II)
8.8.8	> 4.4|4.4|4.4	(28,5–28; J, III)
8.8.8	> 4.4|4.4|4.4	(30,9–31; J, III)
12...12	> 6.6|...|6.6	(31; J, III)

I note that the half-long cantos of chs. 13 and 28 have the same number of lines as do the canticles of the main body of the poems concerned. Furthermore, this overview shows that in the Elihu-speeches we do not find two successive, identical cantos consisting of identical canticles only. Four times we meet this regularity in speech-cycle I, only once in cycle II, and three times in cycle III. With regard to the second speech-cycle this finding is remarkable because this cycle (like the first) encompasses eleven poems, whereas the third cycle encompasses only eight poems.

We can also speak of a distinct design in those cases where two identical cantos divide into a series of canticles which form a symmetric framework, as is the case in chs. 12 (5.7|7.5; J, I) and 24 (7.6|6.7; B, II).[10]

---

[9] Cf. 38,3; but see for 38,2–3 section 1.2.6 below.

[10] The longest canticles are enclosed by shorter ones; cf. above on concentric patterns on the level of the cantos (section 1.2.1). See in this connection also the similar

Deliberate patterning can also be discerned in those poems where two identical or almost identical cantos themselves divide into a series of identical canticles. This is the case in the following structural schemes:

12.10	> 6.6|5.5	(14; J, I; almost identical cantos)
14.10	> 7.7|5.5	(19,6–29; J, II; almost identical cantos)
12.12	> 4.4.4|6.6	(38,4–27; Gd, III; identical cantos)

In this context I also note those poems in which only one canto falls into two or three identical canticles: 6.6 (6,2–13; J, I), 6.6 (9,13–24; J, I), 5.5 (22,21–30; Eph, II), 6.6 (27,2–13; J, III), 4.4 (29,11–18; J, III), 4.4.4 (33,19–30; Ehu, IV), 4.4 (35,9–16; Ehu, IV), 11.11 (40,15–41,3; Gd, III).

In the category of poems with almost identical cantos we can also identify several instances of deliberate patterning on the level of the canticles. Here I note the following examples:

5.2|7.2|7.3	(5; Eph, I)	6.6|5.6	(38,16–38; Gd, III)
6.6|7.3|7	(6; Eph, I)	7.8|6.7|5	(39; Gd, III)
4.4|4.4|3.4	(7; J, I)	3.4|4.4.3|4.4.4	(33; Ehu, IV)
8.4.4|5.5.6	(16–17; J, II)	8.6|7.8|7	(34; Ehu, IV)
5.4|4.4|2.5	(29; J, III)	3.4|4.4	(35; Ehu, IV)
6.6|6.5.5|6.6	(31; J, III)	8.9.4|8.10.4|7.4	(36–37; Ehu, IV)

Generally speaking, in these examples involving almost identical cantos we can detect a tendency to introduce as few new figures as possible on the canticle level. In some instances there exists an obvious parallelism between the corresponding canticles within the respective cantos. In these compositions the number of lines of the corresponding canticles in the subsequent, almost identical cantos, is as close as possible. With regard to ch. 5, e.g., this means that the second canticle of canto I (vv. 6–7) has the same number of lines as does the second canticle of canto II (vv. 15–16; two lines), while the first canticle of canto II (vv. 8–14) has the same number of lines as the first canticle of canto III (vv. 17–23; seven lines). A fine example of this technique we also find in chs. 36–37. In chs. 16–17 (8.4.4|5.5.6) we may speak of a 'semi-symmetric' pattern on the level of the canticles; cf. also the canticle structure of chs. 34 and 39, and the first and the last canticle in ch. 29.

Finally, there are some cantos which seem to display no obvious design on the level of the canticles. Here I think of 20,20–29 (4.6; Z, II) and 41,4–26 (6.8.9; Gd, III).

---

patterns in Pss. 25 and 33: 3.4.4|4.4.3 (see STR); note further 4.6|5.5|6.4|4 (Joel 1), 9.9.10.6|6.9.9.9 (Lam. 1), 9.6.6.6.6|6.6.6.7.9 (Lam. 2).

1.2.5 DESIGN ON THE LEVEL OF THE STROPHES

Here I will make an attempt to classify some patterns which occur on the lowest level of the macrostructure of a Hebrew poem, the level of the strophes. Mostly we are dealing here with a combination of two or three verse-lines. The most distinct designing, of course, we find again in those poems where two or more identical cantos or canticles fall into two or more identical strophes. See, e.g.: 7,1–16 (4.4|4.4|4.4 > 2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2); 8,2–19 (6.6.6 > 3.3|3.3|3.3); 13,5–28 (4.4.4|4.4.4 > 2.2|2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2|2.2); 18,5–16 (6.6 > 3.3|3.3); 28,5–28 (4.4|4.4|4.4 > 2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2); 30,9–31 (4.4|4.4|4.4 > 2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2||2.2|2.2); 32 (9.9 > 3.3.3|3.3.3).[11]

Moreover, the 'half-long' cantos in chs. 8 13 28 exactly fit the strophic patterns of the cantos. The same is true for the introductory unit in ch. 18 (cf. section 1.2.6 below). Nevertheless, this result substantiates my introductory remark to section 1.2 above, that only a minority of the poems in the book of Job shows a pattern with an unbroken series of strophes consisting of the same number of lines. This phenomenon only appears in chs. 8 13 18 28 (42,2–6) 32. Most poems show all kinds of combinations of two- and three-line strophes. Nevertheless, a distinct pattern is undeniable in quite a few of these combinations, too. In the first place, the length of the strophe may change at the point of transition from one canto or canticle to the other.[12] This is the case, e.g., in the following instances:

1.3.3|3.3||2.2.2|2.2.2.1 (24; B, II)
3.3|3.3|2.2.2.2.2 (27; J, III)
3.3.3||2.2.2.2||... (30; J, III)
2.2.2|2.2.2||3.3|...||2.2.2|3.3 (31; J, III)
2 2.2|2.2|2.2||3.3|3.3||... (38; Gd, III)

Secondly, a linear or symmetric pattern can often be detected in the alternation of two- and three-line strophes, when one observes this alternation in a sequence of two or more successive cantos, or canticles. An obvious example of this technique we find in ch. 4 (Eph, I), where each canticle consists of one three-line and one two-line strophe: 3.2|3.2||3.2|3.2. The strophes alternate here in a linear way; see for such linear patterns also 15,2–16 (2.3; Eph, II), 17,1–10 (2.3; J, II), 19,6–29 (3.2.2 and 3.2; J, II), 20,4–19 (3.3.2; Z, II), 21,5–26 (3.3.3.2; J, II), 22,21–30 (3.2; Eph, II), 23,3–17 (2.3; J, II), 31,19–28 (3.2; J, III). In 40,15–41,3 there is a linear pattern in the alternation of three- and *four*-line strophes: 4.4.3|4.4.3 (Gd,

---

[11] Cf. further 6,2–13 9,13-24 11,2–18 14,1–12 15,20–35 27,2–13 29,7–18 31,1–12 38,4–15 42,2–6 33,19–30 35,9–16.

[12] Cf. W.A. Irwin (1946); see part I, 4.2.

III). In ch. 10 the alternation of the 2- and 3-line strophes forms a symmetric pattern: 3.2|2.3||3.2|2.3; see for such symmetric patterns also chs. 9 (3.3.3.2||...||2.3.3.3; J, I), and 14,13–22 (3.2|2.3; J, I). In ch. 12 we meet a combination of a linear and a symmetric pattern in the alternation of the 2- and 3-line strophes: 2.3|2.2.3||3.2.2|2.3 (J, I).

In some poems it is hard to discern a deliberate design in the combination of the strophe-forms. Here I think, e.g., of the strophic schemes of chs. 3, and 37,1–10.

A few times we find a mono-line strophe within the framework of the cantos. This is the case with 3,3.10 5,1.8.17 6,14.24 7,19 22,12 24,1.25 35,4 37,1.14.[13] We find this strophe form generally at the beginning of the cantos (37,1 is found at the beginning of a canticle). The mono-line strophes of 3,10 and 24,25 occur at the end of a canto. In 7,17–21 and 35,2–8 we meet a mono-line strophe at the end of a canticle.

1.2.6 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OPENING AND CLOSING UNITS

Especially in the second speech-cycle we come across many poems which are opened and/or closed by relatively small units, more or less detached from the main body of the poems involved. Before attempting to describe the special characteristics of these units I present an overview of the relevant structural schemes.

	7.9.10	1	(5; Eph, I)	3	11.11.7	1	(21; J, II)
2	10.10		(10; Job, I)	1	5.5.5		(23; J, II)
3	8.8		(15,17–35; Eph, II)		8.9	1	(25–26; J, II)
6	16.16		(16–17; J, II)	2	12.12.11		(38; Gd, III)
3	6.6.5		(18; B, II)		7.11.12	3	(33, Ehu, IV)
4	14.10		(19; J, II)	3	21.22.11		(36–37, Ehu, IV)
2	8.8.10		(20; Z, II)				

So, there are more opening units (10) than closing ones (4).[14] I first present some characteristics of the *opening* units.

The strophe forms in these opening units usually fit the strophe forms of the succeeding cantos; see, e.g., the three-line opening strophe of ch. 18 (canto structure: 3.3|3.3|3.2). This is not the case with 15,17–19 and

---

[13] Cf. Irwin (1946), p. 38; De Wilde (1981), p. 64. I leave out of consideration here the mono-line strophes which sometimes occur at the beginning or the end of the poems themselves. See about these strophes section 1.2.6 below.

[14] In the psalms I detected more closing units than opening ones, in a ratio 2:1. Cf. STR, pp. 472–78. As far as I could ascertain this tendency can also be observed in the book of Isaiah.

23,2. The greater the number of the lines of the cantos, the more lines the opening unit may encompass. A five-line canto may go together with a mono-line opening (ch. 23), a six-line canto with a three-line opening (ch. 18), a fourteen-line canto with a four-line opening (ch. 19), a sixteen-line canto with a six-line opening (chs. 16–17).

From the perspective of the verbal repetitions the opening units are for the most part fully integrated into the formal structure of the poems. Regularly, they show responsions with the end of the succeeding cantos. That is to say, in these instances the opening units can be taken as the *end of an incomplete canto.* The opening units in chs. 15,17–35 and 21, however, link up with the beginning of the cantos. 19,2–5 links up with the beginning of the second canto only. The opening unit of 18,2–4 is integrated into the poem by inclusio only (see *’ḥr* and *mqwm*), and the corresponding unit in ch. 38 (38,2–3) mainly by concatenatio (see *my* and *yd‘*). For 16,2–6 see part III, anal. 3.4.5.

From a thematic point of view I ascertain that the opening units usually contain an opinion about the state of mind of the speaker. These subjective considerations generally regard the disappointing reasoning of the preceding speech(es) and in this way they form an implicit accusation. The units are already recognizable as such by their first line:

> *šm‘ty k’lh rbwt // mnḥmy ‘ml klkm* (16,2; J);
>
> *‘d ’nh tśymwn qnṣy lmlyn … mdw‘ nḥšbnw kbhmh*
> (18,2a and 3a; B);
>
> *‘d ’nh twgywn npšy // wtdk’wnny bmlym* (19,2; J);
>
> *lkn ś‘py yšybwny // wb‘bwr ḥwšy by* (20,2; Z);
>
> *my zh mḥšyk ‘ṣh // bmlyn bly d‘t* (38,2; God).[15]

In 10,1–2 and 23,2 this subjective consideration regards Job’s state of mind about his actual situation:

> *nqṭh npšy bḥyy // ’‘zbh ‘ly śyḥy // ’dbrh bmr npšy* (10,1);
>
> *gm hywm mry śḥy // ydy kbdh ‘l ’nḥty* (23,2).[16]

In 10,1–2 Job’s subjective considerations form the basis for his decision to address himself to God. This intention, then, he carefully formulates in the second half of the opening unit: *’mr ’l ’lwh ’l tršy‘ny // …* (10,2).

Three times the opening units contain a call to listen to the argument of the speaker, which follows in the first canto.[17] Again this characteristic is already recognizable in the first line of the units in question:

---

[15] Cf. Van Oorschot (1987), p. 148.

[16] Note *śyḥy* in 10,1b and 23,2a; see also 21,4a.

’ḥwk šm‘ ly // . . . (15,17; Eph);
šm‘w šmw‘ mlty // *wthy z’t tnḥwmtykm* (21,2; J);
ktr ly z‘yr w’ḥwk // . . . (36,2; Ehu).

After these introductory units the speaker, in most cases, immediately moves over to the real subject of his speech. This is, e.g., the case with 10,3 (*hṭwb lk ky t‘šq* // . . . ; J), 15,20 (*kl ymy rš‘hw’ mtḥwll* // . . . ; Eph), 16,7 (*’k ‘th hl’ny* // . . . ; J), and 18,4 (*gm ’wr rš‘ym yd‘k* // . . . ; B). See furthermore 19,6 23,3 38,4 36,5. A few times there is, from a thematic point of view, no clear distinction between the opening unit and the beginning of the first canto. This is true for the opening units of 20,2–3 (cf. v. 4) and 21,2–4 (cf. v. 5 and see part III, 7.6).[18]

As regards the *closing* units in the book of Job, I note the following characteristics. Three times these units follow a sequence of *almost* identical cantos; see chs. 5 25–26 33. In ch. 21 the closing unit is even preceded by an anomalous canto of seven lines. There is not always a relationship between the number of lines of the closing units and the number of lines of the preceding strophes. Such a relationship can positively be established for chs. 5 (note the mono-line strophes at the beginning of the cantos) and 33 (note the three-line strophes in cantos I and II). However, no such obvious relationship can be established in chs. 21 and 25–26. We are mostly dealing with very small strophes: three times only one line, and only once three lines.

From the perspective of the verbal repetitions, the closing units are by linear patterns of repetitive parallelism (responsions) totally integrated into the formal structure of the poems. That is to say, they can be taken as the *beginning of an incomplete canto.* In addition, 21,34 is connected with the opening unit by inclusio (note the root *nḥm*), and 26,14 is connected with the preceding canto by concatenatio (note the root *byn*).

---

[17] This is also true for the opening units of Num. 23,18–24 and Isa. 1,10–17; note *qwm blq wšm‘* // *h’zynh ‘dy bnw ṣpr* (Num. 23,18) and see Isa. 1,10. The opening units of Pss. 75,2 and 104,1a consist of an introductory praise.

[18] In poems without an opening unit the speaker usually comes straight to the point. This can clearly be observed, e.g., in chs. 3 (*y’bd ywm ’wld bw*, v. 3), 5 (*qr’ n’ hyš ‘wnk*), 7 (*hl’ ṣb’ l’nwš ‘ly ’rṣ*), 14 (*’dm ylwd ’šh* // *qṣr ymym wśb‘ rgz*), 22 (*hl’l yskn gbr*), 25–26 (*hmšl wpḥd ‘mw*); see further chs. 27–31 38,39–39,30 32. In other instances only the beginning of the first strophe deals with some introductory consideration; see, e.g., 4,2 8,2 9,2a 11,2–3. When we leave out of consideration ch. 32, the Elihu-speeches mark a striking exception in this context. The first cantos of chs. 33–35, namely, are completely monopolized by introductory considerations.

From a thematic point of view, the closing units may function as a retrospection to the preceding argument in the main cantos. See:

> *hnh z't ḥqrnwh kn hy' // šm'nh w'th d' lk* (5,27; Eph);
>
> *hn 'lh qṣwt drkyw* … (26,14; J).[19]

Note the demonstrative words *z't* (5,27a), *kn* (5,27a) and *'lh* (26,14a), which refer back to the foregoing reasoning.[20] With his closing line in 21,34 Job goes back to the opening line of the foregoing speech by Zophar; note *tšwbt* and *yšybw* in 21,34 and 20,2 resp. (cf. also part III, 7.6). In the closing unit of 33,31–33 Elihu summons Job to listen to his wisdom (cf. the summons to listen in 5,27b; Eph).

1.2.7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LENGTH OF CANTOS IN SUCCESSIVE POEMS

When one considers the length of the cantos of successive poems in the book of Job, an obvious relationship between the cantos can frequently be noticed. In chs. 4–6 we come across a ten-line canto in each of the three poems: 10.10 (ch. 4); 7.9.10 1 (ch. 5); 12.10.7 (ch. 6). In the first poem (ch. 4) the ten-line canto is even the only building block of the overall structure. With regard to the almost identical cantos of ch. 5, then, we may assume that the poet abridged the second canto by one line (10 > 9). In the following poem (ch. 6), subsequently, the first canto is extended by two lines (10 > 12).

---

[19] Reflecting considerations also characterize the closing units of Ps. 107 (see v. 43: *my ḥkm wyšmr 'lh // wytbwnnw ḥsdy yhwh*; note *'lh*), Isa. 9,1–6 (*qn't yhwh ṣb'wt t'śh z't*, v. 6e; note *z't*), Isa. 56,1–8 (see v. 8; this line is not integrated into the poem by verbal repetitions), Prov. 5 (see vv. 21–23). Outside the book of Job these units usually consist of a closing doxology. This is the case with the closing units of Pss. 7,9b–18 (*'wdh yhwh kṣdqw // w'zmrh šm yhwh 'lywn*, v. 18; inclusio—see *yhwh* and *kṣdq* in v. 9b–c), 17 (see v. 15; inclusio—see *ṣdq* in v. 1), 21 (see v. 14; inclusio—see *yhwh b'zk* in v. 2), 52 (see v. 11), 79 (see v. 13), 145 (see v. 21), Isa. 43,16–21 (*'m zw yṣrty ly // thlty ysprw*, v. 21), Prov. 31,10–31 (see vv. 28–31; this final example is not a doxology to God, but gives praise to the 'virtuous woman'!). In a similar number of poems outside the book of Job we met closing units which contain a prayer. For the most part it regards a prayer for deliverance of the people of Israel. This is the case with the closing units of Pss. 3 (*lyhwh hyšw'h // 'l 'mk brktk*, v. 9), 14 (see v. 7; = 53,7), 51 (see vv. 20–21; prayer for Jerusalem), 82 (see v. 8; prayer for the oppressed), 106 (see v. 47!; inclusio—see *ydh* hiph'il and *thlh* in vv. 1–2), Isa. 43,1–8 (*hwṣy' 'm 'wr w'ynym yš // wḥršym w'znym lmw*, v. 8; cf. Isa. 42,18–19), Isa. 43,9–15 (see vv. 14–15). A few times it regards a prayer for an individual. This is the case with Ps. 20 (see v. 10, a prayer for the king; inclusio—see *'nh* and *bywm* in v. 2), and Num. 23,7–10 (*tmt npšy mwt yšrym // wthy 'ḥryty kmhw*, v. 10c–d, a prayer for Bileam himself). Finally, the closing units outside the book of Job may also contain a reflection on the ruin of the wicked, as in Ps. 104 (see v. 35; cf. the praise in v. 35c too), and Lam. 4 (see vv. 21–22). Like the closing units *within* the book of Job, *outside* the book of Job, too, these units generally consist of only one verse-line.

[20] Cf., however, 18,21 (note also *'lh* and *zh*) 20,29 (note also *zh*) 24,25 (note also *'pw*) (9,24c; note also *'pw'*).

In chs. 12–14 (Job's first reply to Zophar) we meet a twelve-line canto in each of the three poems: 12.12 (ch. 12); 4.12.12 (ch. 13); 12.10 (ch. 14). In the first of these poems (ch. 12) the twelve-line canto is even the only building block of the overall structure (cf. the ten-line cantos in ch. 4). At the beginning of ch. 13 this overall structure is expanded with a 'half-long' canto. In ch. 14, starting from the basic scheme 12.12, we can observe a contraction of the second canto by two lines (12 > 10).

A comparison between chs. 15,17–35 (Eph) and 16–17 (J) reveals that the structural scheme of the latter poem (6 16.16) is exactly twice the length of the scheme of the former poem (3 8.8). In chs. 19 and 20 we meet a ten-line canto at the end of each of the poems.[21] In the following composition (ch. 21) the poet has expanded this 'basic length' of ten lines by one line (10 > 11) to frame two identical cantos. In ch. 22, finally, he returns to the 'basic length' of ten lines. Next, to form a concentric pattern, the pivotal canto is contracted by one line.

In chs. 28–30 we meet eight-line cantos in each of the three poems: 4.8.8.8 (ch. 28); 9.8.7 (ch. 29); 9.8.8.8 (ch. 30). Starting from a basic scheme consisting of eight-line cantos we can observe an expansion with one line in the first cantos of chs. 29 and 30 (8 > 9). In the poems of chs. 31 and 38 the twelve-line units once again appear to represent the standard proportions for the cantos (cf. chs. 12–14). Each of these poems is composed of three cantos. In ch. 31 the pivotal canto is expanded by no less than four lines (12 > 16), in ch. 38 the third canto is contracted by one line (12 > 11).[22]

With the exception of ch. 32, the Elihu-speeches are all built up out of *almost* identical cantos. And it is impossible to detect any standard length as far as these cantos are concerned. Yet, we can observe that from ch. 33 onwards there are constantly *two* almost identical cantos in each poem. Next, the second of these cantos is all the time expanded by one line: 11 > 12 (ch. 33), 14 > 15 (ch. 34), 7 > 8 (ch. 35), 21 > 22 (chs. 36–37). Finally, the length of the cantos in the successive poems is generally increasing. Ch. 35, however, interrupts this tendency.[23]

Sometimes we can assume a relationship between the length of cantos in poems which do not immediately succeed each other. Such a relationship probably exists between the six-line cantos of the speeches by Job's second and third partners-in-dialogue, Bildad and Zophar, in the first speech-cycle (chs. 8 and 11 resp.); note also the six-line cantos in the second speech by Bildad (ch. 18). The five-line cantos of ch. 15,2–16 (Eph) remind us of the five-line canticles of ch. 4 (Eph too). Probably, there is a relationship between the canto structures of the final poem of the second cycle (8.9 1, chs. 25–26; Job) and the opening curse in ch. 3 (8.9.7; Job too—inclusio). Such a relationship may also be assumed between the canto structures of the first poem of cycle III (12.10, ch. 27; Job) and the final poem of cycle I (12.10, ch. 14; Job too). The almost identical cantos of Elihu's last speech (21.22; chs. 36–37) are exactly one verse-line shorter each than the almost identical cantos in the last speech by God (22.23; chs. 40–41). Are we dealing here with a deliberate designing of the Hebrew poets?; and can we interpret this technique of contraction as a subtle token of reverence?

---

[21] These poems also encompass 28 verse-lines each; moreover they display an equal number of cola (!; Fokkelman).

[22] I take this phenomenon as another proof for the thesis that the Elihu-speeches form a later insertion into the third cycle (chs. 27–41); cf. part VII, 2.5.1.

[23] Does this phenomenon point to a later insertion of ch. 35?

2 Tricola in the structure of the poems

2.1 Introduction

In the previous section I studied the formal patterns which emerge in the book of Job as a result of the joining together of verse-lines into higher units, larger poetic entities. These entities I called strophes, canticles and cantos. I left out of consideration the form of the basic building block of these higher units, the poetic line itself. As I noted in the historical outline (part I; cf. also part II, 1) there has always been and still is an important difference of opinion among scholars as to the correct delimitation of this entity. I fall in with the view of those critics who take the bicolon as the standard manifestation of a Hebrew poetic line.[1] See, e.g., 3,3:

y'bd ywm 'wld bw // whlylh 'mr hrh gbr

This view is also mirrored by the layout of Hebrew poetry in BHS (formerly also in BHK), and may be seen as the common view since the beginning of this century.[2] The layout of the poems in parts II–V is also based on this principle.

J. Ley deserves credit for having been the first to conceive the bicolon as the fundamental building block of the Hebrew strophe (cf. part I, 3.1).[3] At the same time this scholar pointed to the existence of yet another line form in biblical poetry, the tricolon.[4] In the book of Job Ley counted about 64 tricola ('dreigliedrige Langverse').[5] There has been much discussion on the phenomenon of tricola in the book of Job. This tripartite line form was categorically denied by Torczyner in his commentary of 1920.[6] Critics who followed in the wake of Ley assumed for the book of Job also about 60 tricola. According to Vetter there are 67 'Tristichen ..., die kritisch unanfechtbar sind und uns den Beweis liefern, dass die tristichische Form des Verses im Buche Job zwar seltener angewandt, aber doch nicht ganz vermieden war'.[7] Hontheim counted 60 tricola ('Tristicha'),[8] and Driver-Gray 61 'tristichs' (at the most).[9] In my opinion, we come across more tricola in the book of Job than we might expect on the basis of the figures presented by the critics mentioned above.[10] On the grounds of the analyses in parts II–V, I conclude that the sum total of the tricola is **84**. These tripartite lines are spread over the successive speech-cycles as follows:

---

[1] Note STR, pp. 171–76 and 524–27.

[2] See STR, pp. 147–60. Scholars like De Wilde (1981), Watson (1984), Butterworth (1992), among others, presently take the colon as the basic building block of the strophe. See in this connection also M. O'Conner, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, Winona Lake (Indiana): Eisenbrauns, 1980; O. Loretz and I. Kottsieper, *Colometry in Ugaritic and Biblical Poetry* (Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur 5), Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1987; W.G.E. Watson, 'Problems and solutions in Hebrew verse: a survey of recent work', *VT* 43 (1993), p. 376; and cf. furthermore W.Th.W. Cloete, *Versification and Syntax in Jeremiah 2–25. Syntactical Constraints in Hebew Colometry* (SBL Dissertation Series 117), Atlanta (Georgia): Scholars Press, 1989 (note pp. 84–86); —, 'The colometry of Hebrew Verse', *JNSL* 15 (1989), pp. 15–29.

[3] See especially J. Ley, *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebräischen Poesie*, Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1887, pp. 8–17. Cf. STR, pp. 131–32.

[4] About tricola cf. J.T. Willis, 'The juxtaposition of synonymous and chiastic parallelism in tricola in Old Testament Hebrew Psalm Poetry', *VT* 29 (1979), pp. 465–80; STR, pp. 196–206; H.W.M. van Grol, 'Paired Tricola in the Psalms, Isaiah and Jeremiah', *JSOT* 25 (1983), pp. 55–73; Watson (1984), pp. 177–85.

[5] 3,4.5.6 (3,9?) 4,16 5,5 6,4.10 7,4.11 9,24 10,1.3.17 11,20 12,3.4.6 14,7.12.13.14.19 16,9.10.12.13 18,4 19,12.27 20,23.25.26 21,17 24,5.12.13.14.15.18.20 26,14 28,2.3.28 29,25 30,12.15 31,34 32,11.12 33,15.23.26.27 34,19.20.33 36,7.16 37,21 39,25; see J.

- First cycle, 25 tricola: 4,16.19 5,5 6,4.10 7,4.11 8,6 9,24 10,1.3.15.17.22 11,20 12,3.4.6 13,27 14,5.7.12.13.14.19.
- Second cycle, 25 tricola: 15,28.30 16,8.9.10.12.13 18,4 19,12.27.29 20,23.25.26 21,17.33 24,12.13.14.15.16.18.20.24 26,14.
- Third cycle, 11 tricola: 28,3.4 29,25 30,2–3a.15 31,7.34.35 38,41 39,25 40,15.

Ley, *ThStKr* 68 (1895), p. 636 (28,3 and 33,26 are counted twice by Ley).

[6] H. Torczyner, *Das Buch Hiob*, Wien-Berlin, 1920, pp. IV–V. Of late this view has been defended by Fohrer (1968), p. 54; Loretz, *UF* 12 (1980), p. 266; De Wilde (1980), p. 65; see also W.F. Albright, 'The Psalm of Habakkuk', in: *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, Presented to Th.H. Robinson*, Edinburgh, 1950, p. 3. According to De Wilde, we are generally dealing with 'von späterer Hand eingefügten Glossen'.

[7] Vetter (1897), p. 29; note especially pp. 26–30.

[8] J. Hontheim (1904), pp. 58–59, and cf. also pp. 289–90.

[9] 3,4.5.6.9 4,16 5,5 6,4.10 7,11 8,6 9,24 10,3.17(?).22 11,6.18.19 12,3.4.6.13.27 14,4.5.7.12.13.14.19 15,28.30 (17,1.11) 18,4 19,12.27.29 20,23 21,17.33 24,5.12.13.15.18.(20).24 26,14 28,3.4.28 30,3 31,7.34 33,15.23.24 34,37 37,21.23. 38,41 39,25. According to the commentary in question 'some of these (tristichs) are open to more or less suspicion, but a number remain which there is no reason whatever, beyond the fact that they are tristichs, for questioning'; Driver-Gray (1921), p. LXXVII—cf. also G.B. Gray, *AJSL* 36 (1919–20), pp. 95–102. About tricola in the book of Job see further: Dhorme (1926), pp. CXLVI–CXLVII and CXLVIII n. 2 ('Selon nous, le vers tristique n'existe point. Il y a un vers accompagné d'un hémistiche ou demi-vers'); Peters (1928), pp. 69*–70*; König (1929), pp. 13–14; Kissane (1939), pp. liv–lvi; Feinberg (1946), p. 288; Irwin (1946), p. 38; Kuhl, *ThR* 21 (1953), pp. 182–83; Snaith (1968), pp. 58–59. As far as chs. 3–23 are concerned Snaith lists a mere 17 or 18 tricola.

[10] According to Korpel and De Moor (1988, pp. 27–28) the Hebrew line can be expanded to a quadrocolon, with reference to Lam. 2,19; see also J. Renkema, *Klaagliederen* (COT), Kampen: Kok, 1993, p. 221. I do not agree with this view and take the tricolon as the largest Hebrew verse. Lam. 2,19 may also be seen as an example of expansion on the level of the strophe (3 lines > 4 lines).

- Elihu-speeches, 19 tricola: 32,11.12 33,15.23.24.26.27 34,10.19.20.33. 37 36,7.11.12.16 37,4.21.23.
- Job's introductory lament (ch. 3), 4 tricola: 3,4.5.6.9.

For the most part these tricola are clearly marked as such by the masoretic accentuation.[11] That is to say, most tricola display a *rebîa' magnum* at the end of the first colon, an *'atnāḥ* at the end of the second colon, and a *sillûq* at the end of the third colon. This is true for: 4,16.19 5,5 6,4.10 7,4 8,6* 9,24 10,3.15.17 12,3.4.6 13,27 14,5.13.19 (cycle I); 15,28.30 16,9.10.12.13 19,12.27.29 20,23 21,17 24,12.14.18.20.24 26,14 (cycle II); 28,3.4 31,34.35 39,25 (cycle III); 32,11 33,15.23.24.26.27 34,19.33 36,16 37,4.21. Another group of tricola displays an *'ôlê wejôrēd* at the end of the first and an *'atnāḥ* at the end of the second colon. This is true for: 3,4.6.9 7,11 10,1 11,20 14,7.12.14 (cycle I); 18,4 20,26 21,33 24,13 (cycle II); (30,3*) 30,15 31,7 38,41 (cycle III); 32,12 36,7.11 (cycle IV).[12] In 20,25 24,16 34,10 we meet an *'ôlê wejôrēd* followed by a defective *rebîa' mūgrāš*.[13] In 16,8 the *'atnāḥ* at the end of the first colon is followed by a *rebîa' mūgrāš* at the end of the second colon. In 3,5 34,37 36,12 37,23* 40,15 the first colon ends with a *deḥi*, and the second colon with an *'atnāḥ*. In 10,22 we meet a *rebîa' magnum* at the end of the first colon and a defective *rebîa' mūgrāš* at the end of the second colon. Finally, there is a small group of tricola in which the first two cola are not clearly separated from each other by masoretic accents. This is the case with 24,15 29,25 34,20. In these lines we even find a conjunctive accent between the first and the second colon.[14] The second colon in these instances is always closed by an *'atnāḥ*. See for 30,2–3a part IV, 4.

---

[11] The masoretic accents often deserve more serious consideration than is usually given to them by critics; see, e.g., P. van der Lugt, 'De strofische structuur van het derde knechtslied (Jes. 50:4–11)', in *De Knecht. Studies rondom Deutero-Jesaja*, FS J.L. Koole, Kampen: Kok, 1978, pp. 102–17 (note pp. 109–13), and Korpel and De Moor (1988), p. 6.

[12] 33,9, which also displays this accentuation, is a normal bicolon.

[13] For the application of the latter accent see I. Yeivin, *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah* (MSt 5), Missoula (Montana), 1980, p. 270 and J.D. Price, *The Syntax of Masoretic Accents in the Hebrew Bible* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 27), Lewiston (New York): The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990, pp. 204–08. I owe these references to Raymond de Hoop (Kampen). However, for 20,25 see also BHS and for 34,10 also BHK.

[14] The pausal form of *lylh* in 34,20a supports Revell's thesis, that pausal forms 'must have become fixed in the tradition at a relatively early time' and mark the end of the cola in Hebrew poetry; see E.J. Revell, 'Pausal forms and the structure of biblical poetry', *VT* 31 (1981), pp. 186–199. The same is true for the pausal form of *'th* in 8,6a; cf. further *yd'k* in 21,17a, *yn'qw* in 24,12a, *lmw* in 24,16b, *ṣr* in 36,16a. And Revell's conclusion that it is time to put 'the received text for the study of ancient literature ... on a rationally

With the exception of 30,12–13, my strophic analyses did not lead me to suppose that in some cases two successive masoretic verses, comprising three cola each, represent in fact three bicola; or that, conversely, three masoretic verses, comprising two cola each, represent two tricola.[15]

In determining whether a masoretic verse in the book of Job is a tricolon it may be helpful to investigate the various patterns of parallelism these lines can display. In the wake of Watson I distinguish the following patterns (using capitals to indicate cola):[16]

(a) A.A'A''. The cola are all bound together by (synonymous) parallelism. This is the most common type of tricolon in the book of Job; see, e.g., 3,9:

yḥškw kwkby nšpw // yqw l'wr w'yn // w'l yr'h b'p'py šḥr

We meet this type in 3,5.9 5,5 (?) 7,11 10,3 (v. 3c is antithetic // with v. 3a–b).17 11,20 12,6 14,5.7.12.13 (cycle I); 15,28 16,9.10.12.13 21,17 24,16.24 26,14 (cycle II); 28,3 30,2–3a 31,7 (cycle III); 32,11 33,15.26 34,20 37,4 (Elihu).

(b) A.A'.B. The first two cola are bound by parallelism, with the third colon there is a link of meaning only; see, e.g., 24,12:

m'yr mtym yn'qw // wnpš ḥllym tšw' // w'lwh l' yśym tplh

We meet this type in 4,16.19 6,10 9,24 10,15 12,3 14,19 (cycle I); 19,27.29 20,25 24,12.18.20 (cycle II); 29,25 31,34 (cycle III); 33,23 34,19 (Elihu).

(c) A.B.B'. Between the second and the third colon is a link of parallelism, the first colon displays a link of meaning only; see, e.g., 18,4:

---

defensible basis' (p. 198), deserves serious consideration. On the other hand we meet numerous obvious tricola in which the end of one of the cola is *not* marked by a pausal form; see *w'yn* in 3,9b, *rgly* in 13,27a, *mym* in 14,19a and 24,18a, *ḥrb* in 19,29a, *lylh* in 33,15a, *wy'mr* in 33,27a, *m'st* in 34,33a. There is no reason to believe we are dealing in these instances with the phenomenon of the "unbalanced distich". The delimitation of the cola in these verses is for the most part determined by the (rhythmical) length of the cola and the internal parallelism of the lines (see below). So, the process of tradition of the text may be more complicated than Revell sometimes will have it.

[15] As against Vetter (1897), pp. 28, and Kissane (1939), pp. lv–lvi (among others). According to Vetter the tricola in 16,12–13, e.g., are to be taken as three bicola. Kissane reduces the tricola of 10,15 and 17 to bicola by combining 15c and 17c to a third bicolon. In this context Kissane also mentions: 19,28–29 24,12–16.22 36,11.16. In 19,15–17 he supposes two tricola to be incorrectly accentuated by the Masoretes as three bicola. As other examples of the same corruption he notes: 5,20–22 11,5–6 29,21–23 30,3b–4 39,20–21. It would have been better, in my opinion, if Kissane had stuck more to his general rule that 'the arrangement of the Massoretic text may be trusted' (p. lv).

[16] See Watson (1984), pp. 178–83. Watson correctly notes that there is some degree of overlap. Cf. also Feinberg (1946), pp. 288–89 and STR, pp. 196–206.

ṭrp npšw b'pw // hlm'nk t'zb 'rṣ // wy'tq ṣwr mmqmw

We meet this type in 3,6 8,6 10,1 (cycle I); 16,8 18,4 19,12 20,23.26 21,33 24,13 (cycle II); 28,4 30,15 31,35 38,41 39,25 (cycle III); 32,12 34,10.33 36,7.11.12.16 37,23* (Elihu; see part V, 5.1).[17]

(d) A.B.A'. Sometimes there is an obvious parallelism between the first and the third colon, whereas the middle colon interrupts this connection; see, e.g., 12,4:

śḥq lr'hw 'hyh // qr' l'lwh wy'nhw // śḥwq ṣdyq tmym

We meet this type in 3,4 6,4 (note *šdy // 'lwh*) 10,22 (note *kmw 'pl* in v. 22a and c) 12,4 (note *śḥq* in v. 12a and c) 13,27 (note *rgly* in v. 27a and c; cycle I); 15,30 (note *yswr* in v. 30a and c) 24,14 (note *l'wr // blylh*).15 (cycle II); 34,37 (Elihu).

(e) A.B.C. Finally, there remain some tripartite masoretic verses in the book of Job which do not exhibit some form of internal parallelism, strictly speaking. Nevertheless, the strophic context of these verses indicates that we are actually dealing with tricola. We meet this type in 7,4 14,14 (cycle I); 40,15 (cycle III); 33,24.27 37,21 (Elihu).

2.2 The tricolon and the structure of the strophe

In almost each poem in the book of Job the regular bicolic lines are interrupted by one or more tricola. There are but few poems which are composed of bicola only. This is the case in chs. 15,2–16 22 23 27 35 38 42,2–6 (seven poems to a sum total of thirty-seven). In the majority of these poems the bicola form two- and three-line strophes. With the exception of v. 4—a mono-line strophe—ch. 35 is composed of two-line (bicolic) strophes only. We do not find poems which are built up out of tricola only. Moreover, in the book of Job, I think, we do not meet lines consisting of one colon only, a monocolic line.[18]

We do come across some strophes that only contain tricola, though.

---

[17] Cf. Watson's remark: 'Much commoner is the tricolon where strong parallelism occurs over the last two lines' (p. 181). However, in 8,6 19,12 20,23 28,4 31,35 39,25 34,33 36,12.16 we are probably dealing with an intermediate form between patterns (c) and (e)

[18] The investigation of strophic structures in the psalms made me conclude that we also had to reckon with the phenomenon of such monocolic lines; see STR, pp. 160–64 and 507–08. During my study of the book of Job the conviction has grown that such monocolic lines do not exist in this corpus of poetic documents; similarly Peters (1928), p. 69*. There is only one passage which seems to point to a monocolic line, 11,6 (note v. 6c); see however part II, 10.1. This conclusion also makes me cautious as to the phenomenon of monocola in other corpora of Hebrew poetry.

The final strophe of the second speech-cycle, 26,14, is a mono-line unit consisting of one tricolon. In ch. 24 we come across two strophes that are composed of two tricola each, vv. 13–14 and 15–16. The same is true for the two-line strophes 28,3–4 33,23–24 34,19–20 36,11–12. In 3,4–6 we find a three-line strophe with three tricola.[19]

For the most part a tricolon is found in two-line strophes, in which the tricolon *follows* a bicolon, 20 times. This applies to the following strophes: 4,15–16 5,4–5 7,3–4 9,23–24 10,16–17 11,19–20 12,2–3 14,18–19 (cycle I); 16,7–8 19,11–12.28–29 20,22–23 24,17–18.19–20.23–24 (cycle II); 30,14–15 31,33–34 (cycle III); 33,14–15.25–26 34,36–37 (cycle IV). There are 9 two-line strophes in which the tricolon *precedes* a bicolon: 7,11–12 10,1–2 13,27–28 (cycle I); 15,28–29.30–31 (cycle II); 31,7–8 (cycle III); 33,27–28 37,4–5.21–22.23–24 (cycle IV). From the figures 20 and 10 one could deduce that a tricolon rather closes a strophe than opens such a small poetic unit. This impression is corroborated by the following observation. We meet 17 three-line strophes which end with a tricolon (scheme: bic.bic.tric): 3,7–9 4,17–19 6,2–4.8–10 10,13–15.20–22 14,10–12 (cycle I); 18,2–4 19,25–27 21,31–33 24,10–12 (cycle II); 29,23–25 30,1–3a 38,39–41 39,23–25 (cycle III); 34,31–33 36,5–7 (cycle IV). In contrast with that we find merely 5 three-line strophes which begin with a tricolon (scheme: tric.bic.bic): 10,3–5 14,7–9 (cycle I); 31,35–37 (cycle III); 34,10–12 36,16–18 (cycle IV). In this connection I also point to the four-line strophe 40,15–18, which opens with a tricolon (scheme: tric.bic.bic.bic).

This result, however, is slightly contradicted by the three-line strophes which contain two successive tricola. Only once the tricolic lines close such a strophe (scheme: bic.tric.tric): 20,24–26. In contrast with that we meet 4 three-line strophes which open with tricola (scheme: tric.tric.bic): 14,13–15 (cycle I); 16,9–11.12–14 (cycle II); 32,11–13 (cycle IV).

Finally, three times we meet a strophe in which the pivotal line is a tricolon (scheme: bic.tric.bic): 8,5–7 14,4–6 (cycle II); 21,16–18 (cycle II).[20] In 12,4–6 we are dealing with an exceptional three-line strophe which opens and closes with a tricolon (scheme: tric.bic.tric).

---

[19] Cf. STR, pp. 196–204 and 497.

[20] According to Hontheim this strophic design is only found in 3,4–6; Hontheim (1904), p. 59.

2.3 The tricolon as transition marker

As soon as the tricolon was discovered—or rather, described by scholars—the notion occurred that this special poetic line could be taken as an indication of the beginning or the end of a thought-unit in Hebrew poetry. Ley noted that 30 to 31 tricola in the book of Job occur at the end of a thought-unit ('Abschnitten, die sich aus dem Sinn ergeben') and about 11 at the beginning of a thought-unit. On this basis he supposed that 'diese Langverse als ein metrisches Hilfsmittel zur Bezeichnung des Schlusses oder des Anfanges der Abschnitte gebraucht wurden'.[21] And Hontheim notes in his discussion about tricola that this line is used with predilection at the beginning or the end of a strophe.[22] Gordis defends the notion that tricola are predominantly used to *conclude* a poetic unit. According to this scholar 'there is a natural tendency for writers as well as for speakers to bring a discourse to a close on a strong note in order to leave a more powerful and lasting impression on the reader or listener. (...) The biblical poets were no different in this respect. We therefore find a tendency, not hitherto noticed, to complete a psalm or a poetic speech (*as in the book of Job*) with greater power'.[23] Gordis enumerates four techniques, which were at the disposal of the poets to reach this aim. As first of these, then, Gordis mentions: '*Increasing the number of stichs in the closing verse*'.[24]

---

[21] Ley (1895), p. 636; cf. also J. Ley, *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebräischen Poesie*, Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1887, pp. 18–19. In this connection Ley refers to Leutwein, who already noted that it is not very hard to divide a Hebrew poem into strophes, 'da die letzte Zeile der Strophe durch eine bemerkliche Länge oder Kürze sich von den übrigen Versen unterscheidet'; L. Leutwein, *Versuch einer richtigen Theorie von der biblischen Verskunst*, Tübingen, 1773, p. 58.

[22] 'Die Tristicha stehen mit Vorliebe am Anfang oder Ende der Strophen'; Hontheim (1904), p. 58. Hontheim counts 16 tricola at the beginnings of his strophes, 24 at the ends of his strophes, and 20 in the middle of his strophes; see Hontheim (1904), pp. 289–90. Peters notes that the tricola are often used with a rhetorical purpose. He distinguishes an emphatic function (e.g., 3,4–6 4,19 5,5 6,4 8,6 10,3 14,13 19,27 31,35–36 34,10 36,6.11.12.16), a marking function (e.g., 10,22 11,20 18,4 19,29 26,14 28,28 29,25 34,37 38,41 39,25), and a function of broad portraying (e.g., 4,16 7,4 10,3.17 12,4 14,12 17,1 18,11 20,26 28,3–4 29,25 30,12–13.15 31,7). The tricola with a marking function, according to Peters, indicate the beginning as well as the end of poetical units; see Peters (1928), p. 70*. In the main, according to Watson, the tricolon does have the function of '*demarcating stanzas* (or segments of poetry), coming either at the beginning or at the end, and sometimes in both places'; Watson (1984), p. 183. See also F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, Baltimore, 1950, p. 11; now (SBL Dissertation Series 21), Missoula (Montana), 1975.

[23] R. Gordis, 'The Structure of Biblical Poetry', in: *Poets, Prophets, and Sages: Essays in Biblical Interpretation*, Bloomington (Indiana), 1971, p. 70 (italics mine, PvdL).

[24] According to Kissane tricola 'are to be found at irregular intervals throughout the book (of Job), but particularly at the *end* of a strophe'; Kissane (1939), p. lv (italics

From the analyses in parts II–V, however, I deduce that we have to be much more cautious with regard to the marking function of tricola than is suggested by the scholars mentioned above.[25] When we take into consideration the tricola which occur in the last line of a *two*-line strophe the views of these critics seem to be corroborated. 16 times such strophes occur at the end of a canto or a canticle: 4,15–16 5,4–5 7,3–4 9,23–24 10,16–17 11,19–20 (cycle I; 11,19–20 is the final strophe of the poem); 19,11–12.28–29 20,22–23 24,17–18.23–24 (cycle II); 30,14–15 31,33–34 (cycle III); 33,14–15.25–26 34,36–37 (cycle IV). There are only 4 of these strophes which occur at the beginning of a poem, canto or canticle: 12,2–3 (poem), 14,18–19 (canticle), 16,7–8 (canto), 24,19–20 (canticle). This positive outcome, however, is contrasted by the position the *three*-line strophes, which end with a tricolon (scheme: bic.bic.tric), take up in the macrostructure of the poems. Seven times these strophes close a main unit: 10,20–22 14,10–12 18,2–4 21,31–33 24,10–12 29,23–25 39,23–25. In 9 instances, conversely, these strophes open a poem, canto or canticle: 4,17–19 6,2–4.8–10 10,13–15 19,25–27 30,1–3a 38,39–41 34,31–33 36,5–7. The same is true for 20,24–26 (structure: bic.tric.tric); this strophe opens a main unit.

Considering the strophes which open with a tricolon we again get a rather positive impression as to the marking function of the tricolon in the macrostructure of the poems. Two-line strophes which open with a tricolon occur seven times at the beginning of a higher unit: 10,1–2 15,28–29.30–31 (ext. // with vv. 28–29) 31,7–8 33,27–28 37,21–22.23–24 (ext. // with vv. 21–22). Four times these strophes occur at the end or in the middle of a higher unit: 3,6–7 7,11–12 13,27–28 37,4–5. Strophes with the scheme tric.bic.bic generally occur at the beginning of higher units too: 10,3–5 14,7–9 31,35–37 40,15–18 (tric.bic.bic.bic) 34,10–12. The strophe of 36,16–18, only, occurs in the middle of a canticle. Our suspicion is aroused, however, by strophes with the scheme tric.tric.bic. Only one such strophe is found at the beginning of a higher unit: 14,13–15; three times these strophes are found in the middle or at the end of a canto or canticle: 16,9–11.12–14 32,11–13.

Finally, after investigating the pure tricolic strophes too, the impression remains that the structural function of the tricola is ambiguous. Three times these strophes occur at the end of a major unit: 26,14 (end of the poem, as well as of the second speech-cycle!) 28,3–4 (canto) 36,11–12 (canticle); and three times they occur at the beginning of a major unit:

---

mine, PvdL).

[25] See also H.W.M. van Grol, 'Paired Tricola in the Psalms, Isaiah and Jeremiah', *JSOT* 25 (1983), pp. 55–73; note pp. 66–69.

24,13–14.15–16 (ext. // with vv. 13–14) 33,23–24.[26] In 34,19–20 we meet a strophe of two tricola in the middle of a canticle.

Approaching the question of the tricolon as transition marker from the perspective of the individual poems the same ambivalent impression remains. There are individual poems in which the tricolon seems to fulfil an obvious demarcating function. This is the case with chs. 4 (vv. 16 and 19; end canticle and end strophe respectively) 5 (v. 5; end canticle) 6 (vv. 4 and 10; 2× end strophe—note the ext. parallelism) 9 (v. 24; end canto) 11 (v. 20; end poem!) 13 (v. 27?: second to last line of the poem) 15,17–35 (vv. 28 and 30; 2× beginning strophe—note the ext. parallelism) 18,4 (v. 4; end canto) 19 (vv. 12.27.29; end canto, strophe and poem resp.; v. 27 ext. // v. 29) 20 (vv. 23 and 25–26; end canto and strophe resp.) 26 (v. 14; end poem!) 28 (vv. 3 and 4; end canto: strophe of 2 tricola) 29 (v. 25; end poem!) 30 (vv. 2–3a and 15; end strophe and canto resp.) 38,39–39,30 (38,41 and 39,25; end subcanticle and canto resp.) 40,7–41,26 (40,15; beginning canto). The sum total of these poems is 16. On the other hand, there are about 14 poems in which the demarcating function of the tricolon is much less obvious. See chs. 3 7 8 12 14 16 21 (however, note v. 33 at the end of the final canto) 24 (however, note v. 12 at the end of a canto, v. 18 at the end of a canticle) 31 (however note vv. 7 and 35 at the beginnings of canticles) 32 33 (!) 34 (however, note v. 37 at the end of the poem!) 36–37 (however, note 37,4.21.23 at the beginning of the strophes concerned, and v. 21 ext. // v. 23 in the final canticle). In the first half of ch. 10 the tricola open a unit, in the second half of the poem the tricola close a unit.

With regard to the marking function of tricola in the book of Job it can be stated with some certainty that these special lines are predominantly found at the end of two- and three-line strophes. About the marking function of these lines within the overall structure of the poems, I deduce there is a marking function of the tricola if these lines are found in combination with only one bicolon (scheme: bic.tric., or tric.bic.). However, when a tricolon occurs in other combinations with one or more bicola/tricola we have to be very cautious of the marking function of these lines.[27]

---

[26] In view of the fact that there are many major units (cantos and canticles) which are composed of two strophes only, there is no ground for resorting to the hypothesis that these strophes mark the beginning *as well as* the end of major units.

[27] This conclusion bears much resemblance to the conclusion in my study on the structures of the psalms; see STR, pp. 502–05.

2.4 Strophes with a 'projecting word' and their function

In Hebrew poetry we occasionally find a combination of two or three lines which create the impression that there is a projecting word (/there are projecting words) in one of the lines. This phenomenon is called 'anacrusis'.[28] Such combinations of lines are also found in the book of Job. Generally speaking, in our book these projecting elements encompass only one word, an emphatic particle. A fine example of this phenomenon is seen in Job's opening curse, 3,7–9:

hnh hlylh hhw' yhy glmwd   *'l tb' rnnh bw*
yqbhw 'rry ywm   *h'tydym 'rr lwytn*
yḥškw kwkby nšpw   *yqw l'wr w'yn*   *w'l yr'h b'p'py šḥr*

The sum total of these strophes with a projecting element in the book of Job is 10 (the verse numbers in bold face indicate the lines with a projecting element): 3,**7**–9 5,**17** 12,**7**–8 (cycle I); 16,**19**–20 17,8–**10** 19,**23**–24 (cycle II); 27,**8**–10 28,27–**28** 38,10–**11** (cycle III); 33,**1**–3 (cycle IV).[29] That is to say, in seven instances the anacrusis occurs in the first line of the strophe (including the mono-line strophe 5,17), and in three instances this phenomenon occurs in the last line of the strophe. In 3,7 and 5,17 the anacrusis concerns the emphatic particle *hnh*; see also 16,19. In 12,7 17,10 33,1 the projecting unit is represented by the emphatic particle *'wlm*, preceded by the conjunction *w-*. In 19,23 we meet *my ytn*, and in 27,8 *ky* as projecting units. In two strophes this rhythmical unit is constituted by an introduction to the direct speech. This is the case with 38,11 (*w'mr*)[30] and 28,28 (*wy'mr l'dm*)—in both instances the last line of the strophe.[31]

---

[28] See Th.H. Robinson, 'Anacrusis in Hebrew Poetry', in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, (BZAW 66), Berlin, 1936, pp. 37–40; Alonso-Schökel (1971), pp. 131–32.144–83.189–90; Watson (1984), pp. 110–11; H.W.M. van Grol, *De Versbouw in het Klassieke Hebreeuws*, Amsterdam, 1986, p. 86. The classes of words Robinson finds most eligible of being explained as anacrusis are: (a) merely introductory—always some form of *'mr*; (b) interjections, as *qwl*, *hnh*, *'yk/'ykh*; (c) pronouns; (d) particles (adverbs and conjunctions), as *mdw'*, *lkn*, *'l kn*. The classes of words Robinson singles out are certainly qualified, in special cases, to be considered as anacrusis. However, the examples given by Robinson to this special rhythmical phenomenon are, in my opinion, for the most part not aptly chosen.

[29] See also STR, pp. 492–96. Note further: Isa. 5,6 (see *w'šythw bth*), 28,11–12 (see *ky bl'gy śph* in the first line and *'šr 'mr 'lyhm* in the second line), 54,9 (see *ky my nḥ z't ly*), Joel 3,1–2 (see *whyh 'ḥry kn*), S. of S. 3,7–8 (see *hnh mṭth šlšlmh*); and see also note 31 below.

[30] So also Gordis and Habel.

[31] Cf. Isa. 49,6 (*wy'mr*), 57,14 (*w'mr*), 63,8–9 (*wy'mr*); Pss. 83,2–5 (*'mrw*), 87,5–6 (*wlṣywn y'mr*), 91,1–2 (*'mr lyhwh*), and 105,10–12 (*l'mr*). See further many prophetic compositions which are introduced by the formula *kh 'mr yhwh* or the like; e.g., Isa.

In 16,19 the projecting element consists of *three* words: *gm ‘th hnh*; cf. *my ytn* in 19,23 and *wy’mr l’dm* in 28,28 (two words).

Generally speaking, the projecting elements are recognizable as such by the fact that from a rhythmical point of view they overload the cola in which they emerge, when compared with the corresponding cola in the preceding or the following lines. See, e.g., 19,23–24:

my ytn ’pw wyktbwn mly   *my ytn bspr wyḥqw*
b‘ṭ brzl w‘prt   *l‘d bṣwr yḥṣbwn*

When we are dealing with an emphatic particle this particle is, in some instances, immediately followed by another emphatic particle. This is the case in 19,23–24 (see *’pw*), 27,8 (see *mh*), 28,28 (see *hn*); cf. also 5,17 (see *’šry*).[32] In the book of Job the anacrusis is for the most part followed by a lexical or grammatical phenomenon which I take as a transition marker.[33] See in this context *š’l* imperative followed by *n’* in 12,7, *klm* and *n’* in 17,10, *šm‘* imperative followed by *n’* in 33,1, and *‘d ph // wp’* in 38,11.[34] In 33,1–3 the projecting element *w’wlm* is also recognizable as such by the linear external parallelism *šm‘ n’/hnh n’* at the beginning of the first two lines:

w’wlm ŠM‘ N’ ’ywb mly   *wkl dbry h’zynh*
HNH N’ ptḥty py   *dbrh lšwny bḥky*
yšr lby ’mry   *wd‘t śpty brwr mllw*[35]

In 19,23 (*my ytn*) and 27,8 (*ky*) the projecting element is repeated at the beginning of the second colon. By their position in the colometric framework of the strophe these particles get a special, emphatic effect.

28,16–17 42,5 43,14–15.16–18 45,14.18 49,8.22.25 50,1 52,4–6 65,8.13 66,12 Jer. 31,2–3. This is not to say that all the introductions to direct speech in Hebrew poetry constitute a projecting rhythmical unit; see, e.g., Joz. 24,2.16.19.22 (note v. 22e too).27 Isa. 44,6.24 45,1.11 49,2–3.4.7.14–15.21 56,1.4 57,15 65,8 (note v. 8c) 66,1 Jer. 31,16–17 Pss. 2,7–9 78,19 82,6–7 Job 28,13–14 (note v. 14; 2×) Lam. 3,16–18 (note v. 18). Cf. J.C. de Moor, FS Loewenstamm (1978), pp. 123–26; —, *UF* 12 (1980), pp. 311–314; —, *Or* 53 (1984), pp. 268.273; Korpel and De Moor (1988), pp. 8–9; S.E. Loewenstamm, ‘The Address "Listen" in the Ugaritic Epic and the Bible’, in: *The Bible World* (FS C.H. Gordon), New York, 1980, pp. 123–31; W.G.E. Watson, ‘Introductions to Discourse in Ugaritic Narrative Verse’, *Aula Orientalis* 1 (1983), pp. 253–61; —, ‘More on Preludes ...’, *UF* 24 (1992), pp. 361–66; Marianna E. Vogelzang, ‘Patterns Introducing Direct Speech in Akkadian Literary Texts’, *JCS* 42 (1990), pp. 50–70; S.A. Meier, *Speaking of Speaking. Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* (SupplVT 46), Leiden: Brill, 1992, pp. 42 ff.

[32] Cf. *’šry* in Ps. 137,8–9; *mh* in Pss. 4,3–4 8,2 85,9 89,8–9; *my* in Isa. 50,8; and *hnh/hnny* in Isa. 28,16 49,22 65,13 66,12.

[33] See section 3 below and part II, 1.3.

[34] Cf. Pss. 35,17–18 56,9–10a 83,2–5 Isa. 57,14—projecting word(s) followed by an imperative.

Finally, we can conclude that the strophes in question obviously mark the beginning or the end of a higher poetical unit, a poem, a canto or a canticle.[36] When the anacrusis is found in the *first* line of the strophe we are for the most part dealing with the *beginning* of a higher unit: 5,17 12,7–8 27,8–10 33,1–3. However, the strophe of 3,7–9 is found in the middle of a canto and the strophe of 19,23–24 at the end of a canticle. When the anacrusis occurs in the *last* line of the strophe we are always dealing with the *end* of a higher unit: 17,8–10 28,27–28 38,10–11.[37]

---

[36] Cf. Robinson, *art. cit.*, p. 38; Watson (1984), p. 110.

[37] This result more or less matches my findings of the marking function of anacrusis in the Psalms; see STR, p. 506 (last paragraph).

3 Transition markers

The marking out of the strophes in the previous parts (parts II–V) especially focussed on the rhetorical phenomena that demarcate them. The so-called 'transition markers' represent a formal device, which, in my opinion, was used by the Hebrew poets in this context. By this term I mean a set of special words and specific grammatical forms which for the most part demarcate the beginning or the end of a strophe. In the introduction to part II (section 1.3) I formulated a provisional survey of the various groups of words and verb forms that are qualified as transition markers in our book. At this stage of the investigation I am able to approach the phenomenon of the transition markers more systematically. The systematic approach which is provided in the following sections is meant to check and to weigh a special group of formal arguments I made use of in parts II–V, to establish the strophic structure of the speeches.[1]

However, to determine the demarcating value of a specific word, we have to face the question in which case it is scientifically justified to consider a given word or grammatical form as 'transition marker'. In this connection we have to determine the chance of a random word turning up in the first or the last line of a strophe. In the chs. 3–42,6, on which my investigation is based, I count 1002 poetical lines. These lines generally form groups of two- and three-line strophes (in chs. 3 and 40–41 also strophes of four lines). I count 19 mono-line strophes, 231 two-line strophes, 163 three-line strophes and 8 four-line strophes. The sum total of these strophes is 421. It follows that the chance of a random word occuring in the first or the last line of a strophe is 42%. When we consider in this light, for example, the demarcating force of the particle *hn/hnh* ('behold') in the framework of the speeches, we find that this particle occurs 46× in the poetic main body of the book of Job as a whole; 33× the particle is found in the first line of a strophe (included 5× in external parallelism), and 4× in the last line of a three-line strophe or a higher poetic unit. That is to say in 72% of all the instances the word marks the beginning of a strophe, and in 9% of the instances the end of a three-line strophe or a higher poetic unit. Considering the fact that the chance of a random word occuring in the first or the last line of a strophe is 42%, I think it well-founded to regard the particle *hn/hnh* as a 'transition marker', denoting in the first place the beginning of a strophe.

---

[1] See also section 1.2.5 above, on the demarcating function of the mono-line strophe (at the beginning of a canto); and sections 2.3–4 above, on the demarcating function of tripartite lines (note 2.3.4, on strophes with a projecting word).

3.1 In the first line of the strophe

To begin with I will put to the test those words which especially demarcate the *beginning* of a strophe. I deal with these words in alphabetical order, as often as possible.

After recording the word or the grammatical form, I note within brackets the translation and the number of times we come across the word or the grammatical form. Then follow the data we need to determine the separating force of the word concerned. First I provide a survey of the instances which demarcate the beginning of a strophe; *siglum*: +. When the beginning of the strophe coincides with the beginning of a canticle or a canto, then the reference is printed in italics. When the beginning of the strophe coincides with the beginning of the poem itself, the reference is printed in italics and followed by: (poem). This item also includes those instances where the word or grammatical form is found in the second and—as the case may be—in the third line of a strophe, but in external parallelism with the same word (or grammatical form) in the first line of that strophe. In these instances the reference is followed by: (ext. //). Such an external, repetitive parallelism is to be considered as an intensification of the demarcating force of the marker in the first line of the strophe; see, e.g., *'wlm* in 13,3–4.

In the following item I note down the instances where the transition marker involved occurs at the end of a three-line strophe or higher poetic unit, a canticle or a canto; *siglum*: end.[2] When the end of the strophe coincides with the end of a canticle or a canto, then the reference is printed in italics. When the end of the strophe coincides with the end of the poem itself, the reference is printed in italics and followed by: (poem). This item also includes those instances where the word is found in the second last line of a three-line strophe or higher poetic unit, but in external parallelism with the same word in the last line of the strophe or higher poetic unit. In these instances the reference is followed by: (ext. //).

Finally I note down all the instances which in this context are to be taken as contrary indications. Within this category have to be included the instances where the 'transition marker' turns up in the second line of a three-line strophe, or in the second line of a two-line strophe which does not come at the end of a higher poetical unit; *siglum*: –.

Each survey concludes with a short paragraph—called 'comments'—in which I note down the percentage of the sum total of the instances a specific word marks the beginning of a strophe, and the percentage the word marks the end of a three-line strophe or a higher poetic unit. Sometimes an observation is made on the distribution of the word over the partners-in-dialogue, and/or the speech-cycles. Finally, as often as possible, I compare the outcome of the given investigation with the outcome I obtained in the Psalms (see STR, pp. 510–24). With the help of this information the reader can form an opinion for himself about the value of the specific word as transition marker.

---

[2] About the demarcating function of these instances see part II, 1.3.

- *’wlm* (‘on the other hand, but’; 8×)

  7× +: *5,8* 11,5 *12,7* 13,3.4 (ext. //; also end canto) *14,18*
  33,1 (poem)
  1× end: *17,10*

  (Comments) 87.5% beg., 12.5% end (convincing outcome). *’wlm* does not occur in the third speech-cycle. Further, this transition marker is not found in the Psalms.

- *’z* (‘then’; 7×)[3]

  4× +: 3,13 *22,26* 28,27 *33,16*
  2× end: *13,20* *38,21*
  1× –: 9,31

  (Comments) 57% beg., 29% end. In the Psalms 17×: 59% beg., 24% end.

- *’y*(*h*) (‘where?’; 12×)

  5× +: 14,10 17,15 20,7 38,19.19
  4× end: 15,23 *28,12.20* 38,24
  3× –: 21,28.28 35,10

  (Comments) 42% beg., 33% end. Viewed apart, this interrogative particle is no obvious transition marker. The function of the word must be seen in the context of other interrogative particles. In the Psalms this particle is found 3× at the beginning of a strophe (*79,10* 115,2 89,50); in Ps. 42,4 at the end of a three-line strophe, and in 42,11 in the middle of a three-line strophe. That is to say, in 60% of the instances at the beginning of a strophe, and in 20% at the end of a higher unit.

---

[3] Cf. M.J. Mulder, ‘Die Partikel *’z* als Konjunktion und Interjektion im biblischen Hebräisch’, in K. Jongeling *et al.* (eds.) *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax, Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 17), Leiden: Brill, 1991, pp. 132–42.

- *'yk* ('how?'; 1×)

  1× +: *21,34* (also end poem)

  (Comments) In the Psalms 4×: 50% beginning.

- *'yph* ('where?'; 2×)

  2× +: *4,7* *38,4*

  (Comments) Cf. *'pw(')* below. The particle does not occur in the Psalms.

- *'k/'kn* ('certainly'; 11×)[4]

  7× +: 13,15 *16,7* *19,13* *30,24* 32,8 (*'kn*) *33,8* 35,13
  3× end: *13,20* *14,22* (poem) *18,21* (poem)
  1× –: 23,6

  (Comments) 64% beg., 27% end. Convincing outcome, because it is striking that the particle *'k* should occur for the most part at the beginning and the end of a *higher* poetical unit. In the Psalms 27×: 74% beg., 22% end.

- *'lh* ('these'; 8×)

  6× +: *8,2* (poem) *10,13* 12,9 *16,2* (poem) *26,14* (also end poem) 33,29
  1× end: *18,21* (poem)
  1× –: 12,3

  (Comments) 75% beg., 13% end. The demonstrative *'lh* is almost exclusively used by Job and Bildad (exception 33,29); note 16,2 and 18,21 (inclusio).

- *'mnm* ('verily, indeed'; 6×)[5]

  4× +: *9,2* (poem) *12,2* (poem) 19,4.5 (ext. //; also end opening unit)
  2× end: 34,12 *36,4*

  (Comments) 67% beg., 33% end (convincing outcome). It is striking that *'mnm* should occur for the most part at the beginning or the end of a *higher* poetical unit. The word does not occur in the third speech-cycle, and is not found in the Psalms.

---

[4] See Muraoka (1985), pp. 129–30.
[5] See Muraoka (1985), pp. 133–34.

- *‘d ’n*(*h*) (‘how long?’; 3×)

3× +: *8,2* (poem) *18,2* (poem) *19,2* (poem)

(Comments) The interrogative *‘d ’n*(*h*) occurs predominantly at the beginning of a *poem*: twice at the beginning of a speech by Bildad (8,2 and 18,2), and once at the beginning of a speech by Job (Job’s second reply to Bildad!). In the Psalms 7×: 100% beginning!

- *’nwš* (‘men’; 17×)

11× +: *4,17* *5,17* *7,1* (poem).*17* *9,2* (poem) *13,9* 15,14 25,4
28,13 32,8 *33,12*
5× end: 10,4 (ext. //).5 25,6 *28,4* *36,25*
1× –: 14,19

(Comments) 65% beg., 29% end. The noun *’nwš* as a transition marker is probably restricted to the book of Job and connected with the typical way of reasoning in the speeches by Job and his friends. The noun occurs in the speeches by Job, Eliphaz and Elihu only.

- *’ny* (‘I’, separate pronoun 1 c. sing.; 25×)

15× +: *5,8* *6,24* 7,11.12 (ext. //; also end canticle) 9,21 13,3
13,13 *19,25* *29,15* *32,6* (poem) 32,17.17 33,6.6 35,4
5× end: *15,6* 19,27 32,10 34,33 *40,14*
5× –: 5,3 9,20 13,2.18 33,9

(Comments) 60% beg., 20% end. The personal pronoun *’ny* is frequently used by Job and Elihu, and does not occur in the speeches by Bildad and Zophar. In the Psalms 70×: 50% beg., 33% end.

- *’pw*(*’*) (‘now, then; thus’; 5×)[6]

4× +: 17,15 *19,6* 19,23 *24,25* (also end poem)
1× end: *9,24* (*’pw’*)

(Comments) 80% beg., 20% end; convincing outcome. Note: *’m l’ ’pw*(*’*) *my* in 9,24 and 24,25—both times at the end of a higher unit! The word does not occur in the third speech-cycle and the Elihu-speeches, and is not found in the Psalms.

---

[6] See Muraoka (1985), p. 137. According to this author the particle is not emphatic but serves to point to ‘logical connection’, which can be best reproduced by translating “then”.

- *’šry* (‘happy’; 1×)

  1× +: *5,17*

  (Comments) In the Psalms 26×: 73% beg., 23% end.

- *’th* (‘you’, separate pronoun 2 masc. sing.; 10×)

  6× +: *5,27* (also end poem) 8,5.6 (ext. //) *11,13* 11,16 15,4
  3× end: *33,33* (poem) 34,32 (ext. //).33
  1× –: 17,14

  (Comments) 60% beg., 30% end (convincing outcome). For the most part the pronoun *’th* is used by the friends of Job (with the exception of 17,14). In the Psalms 117×: 63% beg., 24% end.

- *’tm* (‘you’, separate pronoun 2 masc. pl.; 5×)

  2× +: *12,2* (poem) *32,6* (poem)
  1× end: *13,4*
  2× –: 19,21 27,12

  (Comments) 40% beg., 20% end. When viewed apart, no convincing result. The function of the pronoun must be seen in the context of the separate pronoun *’th* as transition marker (see above). In the Psalms 2×: 100% beginning.

- *h-* (interrogative particle; 87×)[7]

  64× +: *4,2* (poem).*17* *5,1* (poem) 6,5.6 (ext. //) *7,1* (poem) 8,11 *10,3* 10,4 (ext. //).5 (ext. //).10.20 *11,2* (poem).*7* 12,11 13,7.8 (ext. //; also end canto) *13,9* 13,11 *13,25* *15,2* (poem).*7* 15,8 (ext. //) 18,4 (ext. // *‘d ’nh* in v. 2) *20,4* 21,22.29 *22,2* (poem) 22,3 (ext. //).4.5 (ext. //) *22,12* 22,13.15 27,9 (ext. // *mh* in v. 8) 31,3.4 (ext. //) *35,2* (poem) 36,19 37,15.16 (ext. //) *38,12.16* 38,17 (ext. //) *38,22.28* 38,31.32 (ext. //; also end canticle) *38,33* 38,34 (ext. //).35 (ext. //) *38,39* (poem) *39,1.9* 39,10 (ext. //).11.12 (ext. //; also end canto) *39,19.19* 39,20 (ext. //) *39,26* *40,2* (poem) 40,29.31 (ext. //)
  14× end: *4,6.21* (poem) *6,13.30* (poem) *7,12* 8,10 *15,11* *21,4* 31,15 34,33 *37,20* 40,26 (ext. //).27 (ext. //).28
  9 × –: 6,22.26 8,3 14,14 16,3 23,6 25,3 34,17 40,8

---

[7] Cf. H.A. Brongers, ‘Some Remarks on the Biblical Particle *hălō*”, in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *Remembering all the Way ...* (OTS 21), Leiden: Brill, 1981, pp. 177–89.

(Comments) 74% beg., 16% end (convincing outcome). I did not investigate the function of the particle in the Psalms.

- *hw'* ('he', separate pronoun 3 masc. sing.; 39×)[8]

20× +: 3,4.7 *4,7* 5,18 13,19 15,9 *15,20* 15,22.23 (ext. //) 17,3 21,22.31.32 (ext. //) *23,13* 28,3.23.24 (ext. //; also end canto) 31,11 34,29 *37,21*
14× end: *3,6.19* 8,16 *8,19* 9,22 (ext. //) *9,24* *13,16.28* (poem) *24,18* *31,28* *39,30* (poem) 41,2 (ext. //) *41,3.26* (poem)
5× –: 11,11 22,18 23,6 31,4 37,12

(Comments) 51% beg., 36% end. Cf. *hy'* in the following section. In the Psalms the pronoun turns up especially at the end of the strophes; 50×: 62% end, 12% beginning.

- *hn/hnh* ('behold'; 46×)[9]

34× +: 3,7 *5,17.27* (also end poem) *8,20* 9,11.12 (ext. //; also end canto) *9,19* *12,14* 12,15 (ext. //) *13,1* (poem) 13,15 *16,19* *21,16.27* *23,8* 24,5 *26,14* (also end poem) *31,35* 32,11.12 (ext. //) 33,6.7 (ext. //; also end canto).10 *33,12* 33,29 *36,5.22.26* 36,30 *40,4* (poem) *40,15* 40,16 (ext. //).23 41,1
4× end: *8,19* *28,28* (poem) 32,19 38,35
8× –: 4,3.18 13,18 15,15 19,7 25,5 27,12 33,2

(Comments) 74% beg., 9% end. We meet the particle *hn* predominantly in the speeches by Job and Elihu, not in the Zophar-speeches.

---

[8] Cf. Muraoka (1985), pp. 134–37.

[9] See L. Alonso-Schökel, 'Nota estilística sobre la particula *hnh*, *Biblica* 37 (1956), pp. 74–80 (cf. L. Alonso-Schökel, *Das Alte Testament als literarisches Kunstwerk*, Köln, 1971, pp. 405–06); C.J. Labuschagne, 'The particles *hn* and *hnh*', in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *Syntax and Meaning* (OTS 18), Leiden: Brill, 1973, pp. 1–14; F.I. Andersen, *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, The Hague and Paris, 1974, pp. 94–96; D.J. McCarthy, 'The Uses of *wehinnēh* in Biblical Hebrew', *Biblica* 61 (1980), pp. 330–42, esp. p. 334 (now in D.J. McCarthy, *Institution and Narrative* (Analecta Biblica 108), Rom: Biblical Institute Press, 1985, pp. 237–49; A. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, Sheffield, 1983, pp. 62–63.91–95; Muraoka (1985), pp. 137–40; S. Kogut, 'On the Meaning and Syntactical Status of *hnh* in Biblical Hebrew', in S. Japhet (ed.), *Studies in Bible* (ScH 31), Jerusalem, 1986, pp. 133–54; H.-P. Müller, 'Die Konstruktionen mit *hinnē* "siehe" und ihr sprachgeschichtlicher Hintergrund', *ZAH* 2 (1989), 45–76. According to Muraoka the primary function of the particles *hn* and *hnh* is 'to draw the special attention ... to a fact or object which can be said to be important, new, unexpected, etc.' (p. 138).

It is striking that the word should generally mark the beginning of a higher poetic unit. The particle *hnh* does not occur in the speeches by Bildad, Zophar and God. When the particle marks the beginning of a strophe it concerns each time a higher poetic unit. In the Psalms 33× *hn/hnh*: 58% beg., 15% end.

- *w-* at the beginning of the line (117×)

73× +: *4,12* 4,15 *5,15* 5,16 (ext. //; also end canto) *5,24* 5,25 (ext. //) 6,28 7,15.21 *9,25* *10,13* 10.16 *10,18* 11,5.6a (ext. //).6c (ext. //; also end canto) *11,19* 11,20 (ext. //; also end poem) *12,7* 13,27.28 (ext. //; also end poem) 14,10 *14,18* *15,28* 16,21 17,6.7 (ext. //).15 19,4.11 *19,25* 19,26 (ext. //) 21,14.25 *21,34* 22,8.13.24.25 (ext. //; also end canticle) *23,13* 24,15 *24,25* 25,4 27,22 *28,21* 29,17.18 (ext. //; also end canto).23 *30,1* (poem)*.9.12c.16* 31,27 *32,14* *33,1* (poem)*.19* 33,20 (ext. //) *34,16* 34,29.30 (ext. //; also end canto) 35,15.16 (ext. //; also end poem) 36,8.9 (ext. //).10 (ext. //) *36,13* 36,16.17 (ext. //) 37,8 *37,21* *38,8* 38,10.11 (ext. //; also end canticle)

26× end: 6,9 (ext. //).10 *6,23* *8,7* 11,4 *11,12* 11,17 (ext. //) *11,18* *13,4* *14,12* 17,9 (ext. //) *17,10* 19,15* 22,28 *28,12.20.28* (poem) *30,31* (poem) 32,16 *33,22* *36,12* *38,15* 39,15 *39,30* (poem) 40,9.*14*

18× –: 7,14.18 13,22 16,8 21,6.32 22,18 23,16 24,22 31,2.14.17.30 32,12 33,24 34,8 35,10 37,12

(Comments) 62% beg., 22% end. Not investigated in the Psalms.

- *z't* ('this'; 12×)

11× +: *5,27* (also end poem) *10,13* 12,9 17,8 *20,4* *21,2* (poem) *33,12* *34,16* *35,2* (poem) *37,1.14*

1× –: 19,26

(Comments) 92% beg., 8% end (very convincing outcome). The particle *z't* almost predominantly occurs at the beginning of a higher poetical unit. The particle is especially used in the speeches by Job and Elihu, and does not occur in the third speech-cycle. Cf. *zh* in the following section.

- *ḥlylh l-* ('be it far from'; 2×)

2× +: 27,5 *34,10*

(Comments) The expression is only used by Job (cycle III) and Elihu. The expression does not occur in the Psalms.

- *ḥnp* (‘godless’; 8×)

  4× +: 15,34 17,8 *27,8* *36,13*
  3× end: *8,13* *13,16* *34,30*
  1× –: 20,5

  (Comments) 50% beg., 38% end. Nevertheless a convincing outcome, because the noun predominantly marks a higher poetical unit. The function of *ḥnp* as transition marker is probably connected with the special character of the speeches in the book of Job. Cf. *rš‘* in the following section.

- *ḥrš* hiph‘il (‘to keep silence’; 8×)

  6× +: *6,24* *13,5.13* 13,19 *33,31* *41,4*
  1× end: *33,33* (poem)
  1× –: 11,3

  (Comments) 75% beg., 13% end. The verb almost exclusively turns up at the beginning or the end of a higher poetical unit, but does not occur in cycle II. Cf. *w’mr* and *’mrty* in the Psalms.

- *kmh* (‘how long/many times?’; 3×)

  2× +: *7,19* (also end canticle) 13,23
  1× –: 21,17

  (Comments) 67% beg. See also Pss. 35,17 78,40 119,84: 67% beginning.

- *lw* (‘o that’; 3×)

  2× +: *6,2* (poem) 9,33*
  1× end: 16,4

  (Comments) Only found in the Job-speeches. Cf. *my ytn* below, and *lwl’* (‘if not’) in the Psalms (7×: 86% beginning).

- *lkn* (‘therefore’; 6×)[10]

---

[10] See W.E. March, ‘*Lākēn*: Its Functions and Meanings’, in J.J. Jackson and M. Kessler (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 1), Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania): The Pickwick Press, 1974, pp. 256–84; B. Jongeling, ‘*Lākēn* dans l’Ancien Testament’, in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *Remembering all the Way ...* (OTS 21), Leiden: Brill, 1981, pp. 190–200.

3× +: *20,2* (poem) *34,10* 34,25
3× end: 32,10 *37,24* (poem) 42,3

(Comments) Especially found in the Elihu-speeches. In the Psalms 5×: 80% beginning.

- *lmh* ('why?'; 9×)

4× +: *3,11.20* 7,20c (ext. // *mh* in v. 20a) *10,18*
4× end: 9,29 *13,24* 19,22 30,2
1× –: 27,12

(Comments) 44% beg., 44% end. The interrogative *lmh* is exclusively found in the speeches by Job. In the Psalms 17×: 82% beg., 18% end.

- *m'yn* ('from where?'; 2×)

2× end: *28,12.20* (cf. 1,7)†

(Comments) As transition marker the word must be seen in the context of the other interrogative particles.

- *mdw'* ('why?'; 6×)

3× +: 3,12 (ext. // *lmh* in v. 11) 18,3 (ext. // *'d 'nh* in v. 2a)
24,1 (poem)
2× end: *21,4.7*
1× –: 33,13

(Comments) 50% beg., 33% end. Does not occur in cycle III. As transition marker the word must be seen in the context of the other interrogative particles. Does not occur in the Psalms.

- *mh* ('what?'; 50×)

34× +: 3,12 (ext. // *lmh* in v. 11) 6,11.11 *6,24* 6,25.25 *7,17.20*
7,21 *9,2* (poem) 13,13.14* (ext. //) 15,9 *15,12.12* 15,14
19,28 22,13.17 23,5 25,4.4 26,2.3 (ext. //) *26,14* (also end poem) *27,8* *31,1* (poem) 31,2 (ext. //) 34,4 35,7.7
37,19 38,6 *40,4* (poem)
7× end: 10,2 *9,12* *16,6* *21,15.15* 21,21 34,33
9× –: 11,8.8 16,3 31,14.14 35,3.3.6.6

(Comments) 68% beg., 14% end. The particle *mh* for the most part occurs in the speeches by Job and Elihu. In the Psalms 46×: 72% beg., 15% end.

- *mty* (‘when?’; 1×)

  1× end: *7,4*

  (Comments) As transition marker the word must be seen in the context of the other interrogative particles. In the Psalms 13×: 6× at the beginning of a strophe (*74,10* *80,5* *90,13* 94,3.3 *94,8*); 1× at the end of a three-line strophe (6,4); and 6× as contrary indication (41,6 42,3 82,2 101,2 119,82.84).

- *my* (‘who?’; 51×)

  34× +: *4,2* (poem)*.7* *5,1* (poem) *9,19* 11,10 12,9 13,19 17,3.15 21,31.31 *23,13* *24,25* (also end poem) *26,14* (also end poem) 34,7.13.13.29.29 *36,22* 36,23 (2×; ext. //) *38,2* (poem) 38,6.25 *38,28* 38,29 (2×; ext. //).36.36.37 (2×; ext. //) *39,5.5*
  12× end: 9,4 *9;12.12.24* *26,4.4* 38,41 41,2 (ext. //) *41,3* 41,5 (2×; ext. //).6
  5× –: 12,3 25,3 38,5.5 42,3

  (Comments) 67% beg., 24% end (convincing outcome). In the Psalms 34×: 53% beg., 26% end.

- *my ytn* (‘o that’; 11×)

  11× +: *6,8* 11,5 *13,5* 14,4 *14,13* 19,23.23 *23,3* *29,2* (poem) 31,31 *31,35*

  (Comments) Perfectly unambiguous outcome. *my ytn* predominantly occurs in the speeches by Job; in 11,5 only, the expression is found in a speech by Zophar. Cf. *lw* above. In the Psalms 3×: 67% beginning.

- *n’* (‘now!’; 21×)[11]

  14× +: *4,7* *5,1* *8,8* *12,7* 17,3 *22,21* 22,22 (ext. //) *33,1* (poem) 33,2 (ext. //) *40,7* (poem) 40,10 *40,15* 40,16 (ext. //) 42,4
  2× end: *17,10* *38,3*
  5× –: 6,29 10,9 13,6.18 32,21

  (Comments) 67% beg., 10% end. The particle *n’* generally marks the beginning or the end of a higher poetical unit. The particle is not found in the speeches by Zophar. In the Psalms 16×: 50% beg., 38% end.

---

[11] See S.A. Kaufman, ‘An Emphatic Plea for Please’, *Maarav* 7 (1991), pp. 195–98.

- *‘th* (‘now’; 17×)[12]

  13× +: 3,13 4,5 *6,21* 6,28 13,19 14,16 *16,7.19* *30,1* (poem).*9.16* 35,15 *37,21*
  1× end: *7,21* (poem)
  3× –: 6,3 8,6 42,5

  (Comments) 76% beg., 6% end. In the Psalms 8×: 75% beg., 13% end.

In the systematic observations above I did not put to the test the demarcating force of the verb forms with an imperative meaning (imperatives, cohortatives, jussives),[13] nor the vocatives which usually mark the beginning of the strophes. With the help of the traditional concordances it is rather difficult to systematically trace these grammatical forms within a given text corpus. Nevertheless, these grammatical forms have to be put to the test, too. On the basis of the analyses of the transition markers in parts II–V (analysis x.3) I obtain the following results.

- cohortative (23×)

  16× +: 7,11.11 *10,1.1* (poem) *13,13* *15,17.17* (poem) 16,4c.4d 19,18 23,5.5 29,17 32,20 34,4.4
  4× end: *9,35* (poem) 16,4a *16,6.6*
  3× –: 9,14 23,4 31,8

  (Comments) 70% beg., 17% end. This grammatical form almost exclusively occurs in the speeches by Job; furthermore, in one line of a speech by Eliphaz (15,17, 2×), and 3× in the Elihu-speeches. In the Psalms 21×: 52% beg., 33% end.

- imperative (89×)

  63× +: *4,7* *5,1* (poem).*27.27* *6,24.24.28.28* 6,29 (2×; ext. //) 7,7 *8,8* *12,7* 13,6 (2×; ext. // jussive *wthy* in v. 5) *13,13.17* *15,17* (poem) 17,3 *19,6* 21,2.3 (ext. //) *21,5.5.5* 21,14 *22,12.21.21* 22,22 (2×; ext. //).24 *33,1.1* (poem).*31.31.31* *34,2.2* (poem).*10.16.16.16*

---

[12] Cf. Blommerde (1969), p. 30.

[13] For the prohibitive forms see the particle *’l* prohibitive in the following section.

35,5.5.5 *36,2* (poem) 36,24 *37,14.14.14* 37,19 38,4 *40,7.7* (poem) 40,10.11 (2×; ext. //).12 (ext. //).13.13 42,4.4
19× end: 6,22 (2×; ext. //) *6,23* *7,16* *11,6* *14,6.6** *17,10* *19,29* (poem) 32,10 33,32 (2×; ext. //) *33,33.33* (poem) 34,33 *36,21* *38,3.3* 38,18
7× –: 10,9 11,14 19,21.21 33,5.5.5

(Comments) 71% beg., 21% end (convincing outcome). In the Psalms about 124×: 81% beg., 14% end.

- jussive (13×)

9× +: *3,3* (poem) 3,4.7.8 (ext. //).9 (ext. //) *13,5* *17,10* *21,2* (poem) 27,22
3× end: 3,6 *20,23* *27,7*
1× –: 20,28

(Comments) 69% beg., 23% end (convincing outcome).

- paronomastic infinitive construction (6×)[14]

5× +: *6,2* (poem) *13,5.17* *21,2* (poem) 37,3
1× –: 13,10

(Comments) Unambiguous outcome. The grammatical form occurs for the most part at the beginning of higher poetical units.

- vocative (9×)

7× +: *7,20* *33,1* (poem).*31* *34,2.2* (poem).*10* *37,14*
2× end: *16,18* *17,10*

(Comments) 78% beg., 22% end. Perfectly unambiguous outcome, because the vocatives occur exclusively at the beginning or the end of a higher poetical unit! The grammatical form is only used by Job and Elihu, and never regards the words *’l*, *’lhym*, *šdy*, *yhwh*. In the Psalms comparable vocatives occur 40×: 80% beg., 13% end.

3.2 In the last line of the strophe

In this section I will put to the test the words which especially demarcate the *end* of a strophe. Again I deal with these words in alphabetical order, as often as possible. Hereby I use codes comparable to the ones I used in the preceding section. The *siglum* + now indicates the instances in which the transition marker concerned closes a strophe. When the end of the strophe coincides with the end of a canticle or canto, then the reference is printed in italics. When the end of the strophe coincides with the end of the poem itself, the reference is printed in italics and followed by: (poem). Again, there are instances in which these markers form a repetitive, external parallelism. The references to the instances in which one of these markers occurs in the second last line of a strophe—but in external parallelism with the same word in the last line of that strophe—are followed by: (ext. //). In this case the demarcating function of the word is strengthened (see the explanation at the beginning of the preceding section, 3.1). In the following item I note down the instances the word under examination occurs at the beginning of a three- or more-line poetical unit—*siglum*: beg. (beginning). The final item contains an enumeration of the contrary indication.

---

[14] See Muraoka (1985), pp. 83–92.

Again, each survey concludes with a short paragraph ('comments') in which I note down, among other things, the percentages that correspond to the given figures of the survey and, as often as possible, the comparable percentages in the Psalms.

- *'l* (prohibitive particle; 23×)

  13× +: 3,6 (2×).9 *10,2* *13,20* 15,31 *16,18.18* 20,17 36,18.20 (ext. //) *36,21* 40,32
  5× beg.: 3,4 (2×).7 *5,17* *13,21*
  5× –: 5,22 6,29 9,34 11,4 32,21

  (Comments) 57% end, 22% beg. In the Psalms the particle turns up especially at the *beginning* of the strophes; 109×: 62% beg., 24% end.

- *'mr* ('to say'; 50×)

  30× +: *7,4* 8,10 9,7 *9,12* 9,22 *10,2* 11,4 21,28 28,14.14.22 *28,28* (poem) *29,18* 32,7.10 *32,13* 33,24 *34,9* 34,18 35,2.3 (ext. //).10.14 36,10.23 37,19 (ext. //) *37,20* *38,11* 38,35 *39,25*
  10× beg.: *3,3* (poem) *7,13* 9,27 20,7 23,5 *31,24* *33,8.27* *34,31* *37,6*
  10× –: 6,22 19,28 21,14 22,13.17.29 24,15 31,31 34,5.34

  (Comments) 60% end, 20% beg. Cf. *w'mr* and *'mrty* in the Psalms at the *beginning* of the strophes.

- *'nky* ('I', separate pronoun 1 c. sing.; 14×)

12× +: 9,14.29 *9,35* (poem) 12,3 13,2.22 14,15 16,4 21,3
(ext. //) *21,4* 29,16 33,9
2× beg.: 33,31 42,4

(Comments) 86% end, 14% beg. (convincing outcome). The pronoun *'nky* is only used by Job and Elihu. Furthermore, the pronoun often occurs in the first strophe of a higher unit, the poem itself (12,3 13,2 16,4 21,3-4), a canto (9,14 14,15 33,9), or a canticle (13,22 29,16). In the Psalms 13×: 54% end, 23% beg.

- *'p* ('more; even'; 18×)[15]

11× +: 4,19 6,27 9,14 14,3 *15,16* (poem) 25,6 32,10 34,12
35,14 36,29 *36,33**
5× beg.: 15,4 32,17.17 *37,1.11*
2× –: 19,4 34,17

(Comments) 61% end, 28% beg. The particle is not used in the third speech-cycle, but rather frequently in the Elihu-speeches. In the Psalms 23×: 57% end, 22% beg.

- *gm* ('also, yet'; 20×)[16]

9× +: 12,3 13,2 *13,16* 16,4 21,7 30,2 *30,8* *31,28* *40,14*
5× beg.: *16,19* *18,5* 23,2 *24,19* 41,1
6× –: 7,11 15,10.10 19,18 28,27 33,6

(Comments) 45% end, 25% beg. The particle *gm* is almost exclusively used in the speeches by Job. In the Psalms 34×: 53% end, 18% beg.

- *hy'* ('she', separate pronoun 3 fem. sing.; 7×)

5× +: 9,22 28,14 *28,28* (poem) 31,11 (ext. //) *31,12*
2× beg.: *5,27* 32,8

(Comments) 71% end, 29% beg. (convincing outcome). Cf. *hw'* in the preceding section. In the Psalms 6×: 33% end, 50% beg.

- *hm/hmh* ('they', separate pronoun 3 masc. pl.; 3×)

---

[15] See Muraoka (1985), pp. 141–43; '... the function of the particle unmistakably lies in adding something new to what precedes' (p. 141).

[16] See C.J. Labuschagne, 'The emphasizing particle *gm* and its connotations', in *Studia Biblica et Semitica, Th.C. Vriezen dedicata*, Wageningen, 1966, pp. 193–203. Muraoka (1985), pp. 143–46. As against Labuschagne, Muraoka underlines that *gm* 'almost always retains its additive force' (p. 146).

2× +: *6,7* 8,10
1× beg.: *24,13*

(Comments) 67% end, 33% beg. (convincing outcome). In the Psalms 25×: 64% end, 12% beg.

- *zh* (‘this’; 19×)[17]

12× +: 9,29 14,3 *18,21* (poem) 19,3 *19,19* *20,29* (poem)
27,12 (ext. //) *27,13* *28,12.20* *36,21* 38,24
4× beg.: *15,17* (poem) *38,2* (poem) 38,19.19
3× –: 21,23.25 42,3

(Comments) 63% end, 21% beg. Cf. *z’t* in the preceding section.

- *lmʻn* (‘on account of’; 3×)[18]

2× +: *18,4* *19,29* (poem)
1× –: 40,8

(Comments) 67% end. In the Psalms 32×: 66% end, 6% beg.

- *lnṣḥ* (‘for ever’; 6×)

2× +: *23,7* 36,7
2× beg.: 14,20 20,7
2× –: 4,20 34,36 (*ʻd nṣḥ*)

(Comments) 33% end, 33% beg. The ‘contrary indications’ in 4,20 and 34,36 occur in the last strophes of the poems concerned! The word is not found in the third speech-cycle. In the Psalms 18×: 56% end, 33% beg.

- *ʻd* (‘eternity’; 2×)

1× +: *19,24*
1× beg.: *20,4*

(Comments) In the Psalms 17×: 71% end, 12% beg.

- *ʻwlm* (‘duration, eternity’; 3×)[19]

---

[17] Cf. Muraoka (1985), pp. 134–37.

[18] Cf. H.A. Brongers, ‘Die Partikel *lmʻn* in der biblisch-hebräischen Sprache’, in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *Syntax and Meaning* (OTS 18), Leiden: Brill, 1973, pp. 84–96.

[19] ‘Das Gedicht schliesst mit *lʻwlm*; ein solcher Schluß oft in den Psalmen vgl. 16,11 18,51 23,6 28,9 29,10 30,13 u.a. vgl. auch Ex 15,18 und noch in christlichen Gebeten: zuletzt schweift der Blick des Dichters in eine unbegrenzte Zukunft’; H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen* (HK II.2), Göttingen, 4-th edn 1926, p. 50 (with reference to Ps. 15,15c); see also B. Long, ‘Notes on the Biblical Use of *ʻd-ʻwlm*’, *WThJ* 41 (1978), pp. 54–67.

2× +: *7,16* 40,28
1× –: 22,15

(Comments) 67% end. In the Psalms 137×: 61% end, 23% beg.

- *bkl ‘t* (‘at all times’; 1×)

1× +: 27,10

(Comments) In the Psalms 5×: 60% end, 40% beg.

- *rš‘* (‘wicked man’; 26×)

17× +: *8,22* (poem) 9,22 *9,24* *11,20* (poem) 16,11 *20,29* 21,7.28 22,18 *24,6* *27,7.13* 34,18.26 38,13 *38,15* 40,12
6× beg.: 3,17 *10,3* *15,20* *18,5* *21,16* 21,17 (ext. //)
3× –: 20,5 36,6.17

(Comments) 65% end, 23% beg. Probably the noun *rš‘* as transition marker is specific to the poetry of the book of Job. The word is found in each speech-cycle and with each of the speakers. Cf. *ḥnp* in the preceding section.

- *tqwh* (‘hope’; 13×)

8× +: *4,6* *5,16* 7,6 *8,13* *11,18.20* (poem) 14,19 19,10
3× beg.: *6,8* *14,7* *27,8*
2× –: 17,15.15

(Comments) 62% end, 23% beg. The noun *tqwh* as a transition marker is probably specific to the book of Job. The noun does not occur in the speeches by God and Elihu.

3.3 Conclusion

When we compare the list of transition markers noted down in the preceding sections with the lists compiled on the basis of my strophic analyses in the Psalms[20], we find that the similarities are more striking than the differences. I consider the rhetorical use of the separate pronoun of the first person singular (c.) as a striking example of this outcome; see *’ny* in section 3.1 above and *’nky* in section 3.2 above. This result confirms my supposition that the words and grammatical forms in question somehow possess a general validity in Hebrew poetry as transition markers.

---

[20] See STR, pp. 508–24. Included are now also Pss. 5 17 20 73 84 86 110.

One of the most obvious differences between the markers in the book of Job and the Psalms regards the vocative use of the name of God. In the Psalms we meet this grammatical form time and again as *'dny*, *'l*, *'lhym*, *yh*, *yhwh*. And these vocatives clearly indicate the beginning of a strophe. In the book of Job these vocatives do not occur at all. Naturally, this outcome is connected with the special character of each of the books, prayer (invocation of God) and argument (speaking about God) respectively.

In the Psalms the word *slh* obviously demarcates the end of a strophe. In the book of Job this word does not occur at all.

In the Psalms we come across the word *'šry* ('happy') 26×; this is a transition marker generally denoting the begining of a strophe. In the book of Job the word occurs in 5,17 only; but also as marker of the *beginning* of a poetic unit, a canto.

In the Psalms we meet the word *m'd* ('very') 35×. The adverb is an obvious transition marker, particularly denoting the end of a strophe. In the book of Job the word occurs only twice: in 8,7 at the end of a strophe and in 35,15 at the beginning of a two-line strophe (which represents, however, the final strophe of the poem!).

In the Psalms we meet a broad spectrum of expressions denoting 'eternity' or 'a long time', all demarcating the end of a strophe. In the book of Job there is not so much variety; see *lnṣḥ*, *'d*, and *'wlm*. And the demarcating value in these instances is not as obvious as one might wish. In the Psalms we also meet expressions like *'rk ymym*, *dwr wdwr*, *tmyd*. We did observe, however, that references to death and the end of life generally function as a device of closure in the book of Job (see parts II–IV; cf. part VII, 1.2).

In some instances I had to conclude that a transition marker which in the Psalms especially indicates the beginning of a strophe, in the book of Job generally turns up at the end of a strophe; see *'l* (prohib.) and also *'mr* ('to say'). The opposite case is also found; see *hw'* in section 3.1 above. These instances show that in some cases further study is required to determine with more certainty whether a word or grammatical form can be taken as a transition marker in Hebrew poetry. And for the time being such rhetorical devices have to be utilized with due care.

In the Psalms I noted down the particle *'m* ('if) as a marker of the end of a strophe; however, the demarcating force was not very clear. In the book of Job the function of this particle as a transition marker was so ambiguous that I left it totally out of consideration for the moment.

On the other hand, in the book of Job we do find some transition markers that do not occur in the Psalms. This is the case with *'wlm*, *'yph*, *'mnm*, *'pw*, *ḥlylh l-*, *mdw'*.

PART VII

The Design of the Speech-Cycles

1 Job 25–26 as Job's closing speech within the second cycle

1.1 Introduction

It is generally supposed that the main body of the book of Job consists —in broad outline— of three cycles of speeches between Job and his friends, followed by the speeches of Elihu, and by an answer from heaven. This main body of poetic speeches is embedded in a framework which is supposed to have originally been an independent narritive, a legend. The speeches of Elihu (chs. 32–37), which break up the coherence between the end of ch. 31 and God's answers from the whirlwind (chs. 38–41), are often taken as a later insertion. As to the structure of the three speech-cycles between Job and his friends, most scholars assume that the lament of Job in ch. 3 acts as an introductory speech, which generates a first speech-cycle (chs. 4–14), a second speech-cycle (chs. 15–21), and a third speech-cycle (chs. 22—27/31[?]). In this view, Job is each time responding to the speeches of Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar respectively. However, this structuring is a product of modern scholarship and nowhere indicated by the poet himself nor by any of the redactors.[1] And Fohrer's proposal, which takes the speeches of Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar as an answer to the speeches of Job, has met with some response.[2] Thus, Andersen in his commentary is not willing to tie himself down to one specific scheme,[3] and Habel does not present a plain description of the three speech-cycles.[4] Finally, I could point to scholars like Budde, Driver-Gray and Hölscher who obviously do not attach much value to such overall schemes.[5]

---

[1] See also D. Wolfers, 'The speech-cycles in the book of Job', *VT* 43 (1993), pp. 385–402.

[2] According to this view the three cycles comprise the following chapters: chs. 3–11 (cycle I), 12–20 (cycle II), 21–27 (cycle III). See Fohrer (1963), pp. 34–36; E. Sellin and G. Fohrer, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 11th

I do not dwell on this subject because I too have doubts about a well-defined scheme underlying the total structure of the book of Job. To the contrary, the preceding investigation of the poetic structures of the individual Hebrew poems has revealed specific patterns underlying these poems constituting disjunctions which are never indicated explicitly in the Hebrew text. And there are several features, in my opinion, that suggest the same holds good for the book of Job as a whole. Eissfeldt and Kuhl have rightly pointed to the relationship between the structure of this large poetic composition and its interpretation and purpose.[6] Therefore, it would be very unwise not to pay due attention to the phenomena which constitute the total structure of our book.

Let us take for a moment the traditionally accepted 'three cycle' division of the speeches between Job and his friends as the starting-point for our own investigation. Then we have to accept the well-known fact that this framework seems to break down in the third speech-cycle. Scholars point to the following phenomena: (a) in 24,18–24 Job—according to MT—is describing the destruction of the wicked (cf. also 27,14–23); but this very theme is the hall-mark of the speeches by Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar and their sentiments are explicitly challenged by Job in ch. 21; (b) the speech of Bildad (ch. 25), which comprises only five lines, is relatively short; (c) a third speech of Zophar is missing entirely; (d) after this 'defeat' of his part-

---

edn 1969, pp. 356–57 and 360; Epping-Nelis (1968), p. 11; O. Kaiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 2nd edn 1970, p. 308; Clines (1989), pp. xxxvi–xxxvii (but cf. p. 285 too); Y. Hoffman, 'Ancient Near Eastern Literary Conventions and the Restoration of the Book of Job', *ZAW* 103 (1991), p. 405. Cf. also N.H. Snaith, *The Book of Job*, London: SCM Press, 1968, pp. 9–10 (chs. 3–13 [I], 14–21,21 [II], '21,22–28,28' [III]) and M.P. Reddy, 'The Book of Job—A Reconstruction', *ZAW* 90 (1978), pp. 59–94 (note pp. 67, 78–79 and 86: chs. 3–13 [I], 14–21+23 [II], 24–27+29–30+22+28+31 [III]).

[3] Andersen (1976), p. 174; cf. also p. 22: 'But it is not clear how the several speeches are to be grouped in the three cycles'.

[4] Cf. Habel (1985), pp. 37–38.

[5] Cox thinks that the 'three cycle' division is better ignored, because it 'imposes a modern category on an old poem and so obscures its movement'; D. Cox, 'A Rational Inquiry into God: Chapters 4–27 of the Book of Job', *Greg* 67 (1986), p. 623, with reference to R.A.F. Mackenzie, 'Job', in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968, p. 515.

[6] O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 3rd edn 1964, p. 616; C. Kuhl, 'Neuere Literarkritik des Buches Hiob', *ThR* 21 (1953), p. 307. See also Bezuidenhout (1987), p. 709.

ners in dialogue Job is immodestly long-winded in the following chapters (see chs. 26–31).[7] Even scholars who deem highly of biblical inspiration like Kroeze and Hartley cannot avoid the conclusion that the Hebrew text of the so-called third cycle must have suffered some damage.[8] I do not agree with scholars like Budde, Peters, Weiser, Möller and Andersen who try to prove that nothing is wrong with MT and that we are dealing with the original design.[9] According to this line of thought 'Bildad's desultory words (ch. 25) and Zophar's complete silence . . . could be the author's way of showing that the debate had collapsed'.[10] On the other hand I am not as pessimistic as most scholars, who believe, for example, that 'der dritte Redegang nur als Torso auf uns gekommen ist'[11] or that we have in these chapters 'a collection of miscellaneous pieces, not placed in any recognizable order and not arranged according to any recognizable plan'[12] and that we can present a reconstruction of the original text only with a great deal of reservation.[13] In my opinion the problems enumerated above have their origin in two circumstances: (a) an interchange of headings in chs. 24–26; and (b) a false representation of the structure and scope of the so-called second (and third) speech-cycle. I will make a case for another view of the macrostructure of the book of Job (see below, Table II). This view is based on the theory that *the poetic body of our book as a whole is constructed of three speech-cycles* plus the Elihu-speeches. The most important features of this new approach are:

1. The discussion between Job and his three friends consists of only two speech-cycles: chs. 4–14 and 15–26; the third cycle comprises the

---

[7] In my opinion there is also a relation between these problems and two other questions which have always provided a lot of food for reflection to exegetes: (a) what is the function of the poem about 'the quest for wisdom' in ch. 28?; (b) why are there two (!) speeches from the whirlwind (chs. 38–41)? I deal with these questions in section 2 below.

[8] See also *La Bible de Jérusalem*, Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1974; and cf. the methodological considerations by Hoffman, *art. cit.*, pp. 399–411 (note p. 411).

[9] See also D. Wolfers, 'Job: The Third Cycle: Dissipating a Mirage, Part I–II', *Dor le Dor* 16 (1987–88), pp. 217–26 and 17 (1988–89), pp. 19–25; and cf. W. Vogels, *Job* (Belichting van het bijbelboek), Boxtel: Katholieke Bijbelstichting, 1989.

[10] Andersen (1976), p. 54.

[11] Kuhl, *art. cit.*, p. 280.

[12] Snaith, *op. cit.*, p. 62. So also F. Baumgärtel, *Der Hiobdialog, Aufriss und Deutung* (BWANT IV.9), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933, p. 156 ('Trümmerhaufen').

[13] For overviews of reconstructions proposed by other scholars see: M.A. Regnier, 'La distribution des chapitres 25–28 du livre de Job', *RB* 33 (1924), pp. 186–88; Kuhl, *art. cit.*, pp. 277–83; H.H. Rowley, 'The Book of Job and its Meaning', in H.H. Rowley, *From Moses to Qumran*, London: Lutterworth, 1963, pp. 163–64 n. 2; Snaith, *op. cit.*, pp. 100–03 ('Appendix I').

dialogue between Job and God: chs. 27–31 plus 38–41.

2. Unlike the first and the third cycles, the second speech-cycle shows a concentric arrangement of the speeches between Job and his partners in dialogue; the discussion between Zophar and Job (chs. 20–21) forms the pivot of that second round.

3. The structure of the first and second cycles is especially determined by the speeches of Job himself.

4. The dialogue between Job and God in chs. 27–31 plus 38–41 (cycle III) is a later addition to the discussion between Job and his three friends.

5. Each speech-cycle comprises exactly 270 lines of Hebrew poetry.

The tenability of this theory depends to a great extent on the possibility of taking chs. 25–26 as the final poem of my second cycle. The question has to be answered whether this material can be interpreted as some kind of conclusion to the discussion between Job and his three friends.

In part III, 11 I showed that chs. 25 and 26 as a whole, when brought together, form a perfectly complete unit. The poem as a whole is a speech by Job himself and its original heading is to be found in 26,1: *wy‘n ’ywb* (!) *wy’mr* (‘then Job [!] answered saying’).[14] Subsequently it seems most reasonable to suppose that 25,1, *wy‘n bldd hšḥy wy’mr* (‘then Bildad the Shuhite answered saying’) represents the lost heading of ch. 24.[15] This interpretation is supported by the following phenomenon. Just as the beginning of Bildad's second speech ties in with the beginning of his first speech (see *‘d ’n*[*h*] in 8,2 and 18,2; cf. Hontheim (1904), pp. 12–13), so the end of Bildad's third speech ties in with the end of his first speech (see *’ynnw* in 8,22 and 24,24).[16]

---

[14] This conclusion is supported by one manuscript, Ken^{196}, which reads in 25,1 *’ywb* instead of *bldd hšḥy*. The theme of the second strophe about the futility of mankind (25,4–6) is not specific to Eliphaz (cf. 4,17–19 and 15,14–16). On this point Job is able to go along with his partners in dialogue; see 9,2. Cf. also 25,2a with 12,13a and 16a. Andersen notes that Bildad ‘has made a significant retreat’ in ch. 25: ‘He no longer speaks so confidently about the judgment of God on the wicked’ (pp. 214–15; see also p. 215 n. 2). In chs. 20 and 22, however, we rather observe a hardening in points of view with the friends, Zophar and Eliphaz respectively.

[15] See for ch. 24 as a speech by one of the friends part III, 10.6.

[16] Cf. also *šḥr* in 24,5 and 8,5 (also 7,21)†. Möller aptly notes that Bildad gladly speaks about ‘light’, with reference to 24,13–18; see Möller (1955), p. 66. Habel tentatively argues that Zophar is the intended speaker in this poem (note p. 358; cf. Dhorme and Pope among others).

Table II

Prologue (prose): narrative of a patient Job (chs. 1–2)

Job's opening curse (ch. 3)

FIRST SPEECH-CYCLE
(chs. 4–14)

Eliphaz (4–5) <> Job (6–7)
Bildad (8) <> Job (9–10)
Zophar (11) <> Job (12–14)

270 lines

SECOND SPEECH-CYCLE
(chs. 15–26)

(a) Eliphaz (15) <> Job (16–17)
(b) Bildad (18) <> Job (19)
(c) Zophar (20) <> Job (21)
(b') Eliphaz (22) <> Job (23)
(a') Bildad (24) <> Job (25–26)

270 lines

God and Job (40,1–5)

THIRD SPEECH-CYCLE
(chs. 27–31 + 38–41)

Job (27–28)
Job (29–31)

THE ELIHU-SPEECHES
(chs. 32–37)

—later insertion—

God's first reply (38–39)
God's second reply (40,6–41,26)

270 lines

The answer by Job (42,2–6)

Epilogue (prose): narrative of a patient Job (42,7–17)

Now, I will investigate the possibility whether chs. 25–26 represent Job's final speech within my second cycle.

1.2 Conceptions of death and the underworld in chs. 3–26

In part III, 11.6 it was argued that the main theme of chs. 25–26 is to be found in the first strophes of the cantos, that is to say in 25,2–3 and 26,5–7. My point now is that the second line of 26,5–7, 'naked is Sheol before him // and Abaddon has no covering' (*'rwm š'wl ngdw / w'yn kswt l'bdwn*), is especially important for understanding the structure of the speech-cycles between Job and his three friends. Hence, this section is devoted to conceptions of death and the underworld as they emerge in chs. 3–26.

1.2.1 DEATH AND THE UNDERWORLD IN CHS. 3–14 (CYCLE I)

Considerations about death and the underworld we find especially throughout the first speech-cycle (chs. 4–14) and in Job's introductory lament (ch. 3). Furthermore, in chs. 4–14 these considerations only occur in the speeches of Job himself. The replies of Job in cycle I are each time composed of at least two poems; his first reply to Zophar even comprises three poems (chs. 12–14). As demonstrated in part II all these poems exactly coincide with the chapter divisions.[17] And time and again in the last poem of these replies Job addresses himself directly to God. Lastly, it is precisely in these final poems that Job takes up the theme of his impending destiny, death and the underworld, that is to say in chs. 7, 10 and 14.[18]

From the very outset of the discussion with his friends the portrayal of life after death plays an important part in the realm of ideas of the protagonist of our book. Job's opening lament in ch. 3 is largely devoted to this theme. The central stanza of the poem, vv. 11–19, is an expression of

---

[17] Cf. also Möller (1955), pp. 40–47.

[18] Cf. Dhorme (1926), p. 100 with reference to 7,21: 'Les discours de Job se terminent souvent par la vision de la mort, de la tombe, du Shéol (x,21–22; xiv,20–22; xvii,13–16; xxi,32–33)'. See also Horst (1968), p. 263; Fohrer (1963), p. 296; Hartley (1988), p. 153; Clines (1989), pp. 251, 336, 392, 400. We are dealing here with a phenomenon that can be observed in all kinds of poetic traditions: 'Closure is also secured simply through the allusion to death, which is one of the most common and effective non-structural devices'; Barbara Herrnstein Smith, *Poetic Closure. A Study of How Poems End*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968, p. 101 (see also pp. 102 and 175–76). See also E. Häublein, *The Stanza* (The Critical Idiom Series), New York: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1978 (cf. Cotter [1992], p. 189 n. 69). Job's addresses to God are a peculiarity of the first speech-cycle; see D. Patrick, 'Job's Address of God', *ZAW* 91 (1979), pp. 268–82.

Job's desire to be with the dead. The underworld[19] is depicted as appealing and comfortable (vv. 13-19). The verb *nwḥ* ('be at rest', vv. 13b and 17b) is a key-word in the canto; cf. also v. 26b.[20] Only death can free Job from his painful existence. In the concluding canto (vv. 20–26) Job puts his own wish in a wider perspective. Everybody who suffers is longing for rest in the nether world (vv. 21–22). But God prevents suffering mortals from dying by putting a hedge around them (v. 23b) and by giving them light (v. 20a). Life is associated with 'light' (v. 20) and death with 'a hidden treasure' (v. 21); see also v. 16.[21] These metaphors initiate the idea that a human being is 'hidden' from God's life-giving light, once he has crossed the border of Sheol.

In the second poem of his reply to Eliphaz (ch. 7) Job's impending death is one of the cornerstones on which the composition is built. Each of the three cantos is concluded by a strophe in which Job directly addresses God with reference to his hopeless situation (vv. 7–8, 15–16, 21).[22] We again come across Job's wish to be dead (vv. 15–16; cf. 6,9), but in this poem it becomes evident that laments like these cannot be taken as Job's ultimate desire. In vv. 7–8 and 21 the reference to his impending death functions as a warning towards God. The time willl come when God wil be looking for Job in vain—to forgive his sins (see v. 21a–b)—because he will not be (*wšḥrtny w'ynny*, v. 21d). In this context we must probably interpret v. 8b ('Your eye will be on me, and I'll be gone'): there will be no further opportunity for restoration.[23] So, these lines point to the idea that as soon as Job has arrived at the underworld (*l'pr 'škb*, v. 21c), he will be beyond the reach of God's mercy.

The idea that God is not able to penetrate the underworld with his life-giving force is a notion we also find in ch. 10, the second poem of Job's reply to Bildad. In this part of his speech Job is concerned with the question why God should ruin His own creature. Again, it is Job's desire to be dead (vv. 18–19; cf. 3,11). But finally Job induces God to let him alone before he goes to Sheol (vv. 20–22). In v. 22 the underworld is depicted as 'the land of utter darkness' (v. 22a), and as the land 'which shines like darkness' (v. 22c). The root *yp'* (hiph'il, 'to shine') is a key-word in the poem. This root embraces both cantos of the composition, vv. 3c and 22c.[24] In v. 3c Job confronts God with a paradoxical fact: 'on the counsel of the wicked you beam' (*w'l 'ṣt rš'ym hwp't*). Probably we have to interpret the final colon of v. 22 against the background of this statement. That is to say, when in v. 22c the underworld is depicted as the land which 'shines' like darkness, then, according to Job, God is not able to penetrate with his light the realm of death (cf. 3,20–21; see above).

---

[19] The noun *š'wl*, however, is not used here. We only meet with a circumlocution for *š'wl*, some kind of 'euphemism' (Pope), namely *šm* ('there', v. 17a and b).

[20] See part II, 2 above.

[21] The noun *'wr* ('light') and the root *ṭmn* ('to hide') play an important part in the structure of ch. 3; see part II, 2 above.

[22] See part II, 6 above.

[23] So rightly Pope; contra Habel ('In place of a victim there will be a vacuum'). With reference to 7,16 and 19 Clines consistently argues that Job 'does not appeal to God to pay attention to him' (p. 168); he takes vv. 8b and 21c–d as 'an emphatic way of affirming that he (Job) will no longer be' (p. 195). In my opinion, these sentences imply Job's conviction that in the end God intends to deliver him from his distress. Cf. also *zkr* in v. 7a; the summons 'to remember' constitutes a central theme in psalms of lament and is a fundamental petition for deliverance.

In the final chapter of cycle I, the third poem of Job's reply to Zophar (ch. 14), the portrayal of the underworld as a place inaccessible to God is thought out to its ultimate conclusion. In v. 13 Sheol is explicitly delineated as a place where Job would be safe ('hidden'!) from God's anger; cf. 3,20–21 (see also 6,8–10 and 7,13–16).[25] But the poem as a whole deals with death as the definite, irreversible end of a human being—not only of Job himself but of mankind in general; see vv. 10–12 and 20–22 (final strophes of the cantos) and cf. also v. 14.[26] And it is this very idea which fills mortals with utter despair and drives a human being to distraction. The noun *tqwh* ('hope') is one of the key-words in this context.[27] The noun connects v. 7a ('A tree, though cut down, has hope') with v. 19c ('And you destroy man's hope'); cf. 7,6 and 19,10. The cola in question create an antithetic parallelism within the poem and constitute one of the central themes of this last poem of the first speech-cycle: there is no hope in Sheol for mankind in general (cf. part II, 13.6). As I have tried to demonstrate, we may assume that this ultimate conclusion is fundamentally based on the conception of the underworld as a godforsaken place, a region where God is not able to make his influence felt (cf. Isa. 38,18 Jonah 2,5 Ps. 88,6).

1.2.2 DEATH AND THE UNDERWORLD IN CHS. 15–26 (CYCLE II)

In the discussion between Job and his three friends, there are two more poems that deal with death and the underworld, one at the beginning and one at the end of my second speech-cycle (chs. 15–26): Job's second reply to Eliphaz (chs. 16–17) and Job's third reply to Bildad (chs. 25—26).[28]

---

[24] See part II, 9 above.

[25] Instead of *ṭmn* (cf. ch. 3) the poets uses the roots *ṣpn* (hiph'il) and *str* (hiph'il) to denote the image of the underworld as a 'hiding-place'.

[26] The same idea with regard to the underworld is represented by the metaphors of 7,9–10 10,21a and 16,22b. The designation of Sheol as 'the path/land of no return' is paralleled in Akkadian literature; see the 'Descent of Ishtar to the Nether World', lines 1, 12, 41 (ANET, pp. 106–09).

[27] See part II, 13 above.

The two chapters of Job's second reply to Eliphaz (chs. 16–17) together constitute one large-scale, complete poem. After an introduction of two 3-line strophes (16,2–6) this composition is constructed of two cantos (16,7–22 and ch. 17).[29] As to the underworld, however, no new points of view are put forward. The first canto ends with the image of death as an irreversible datum (16,22b; cf. n. 26 above). In the last strophes of canto II (17,13–16) the underworld is depicted as a place where there is no hope left for a human being (cf. ch. 14). It is a region where the light (of God) cannot penetrate (v. 13b)! Once again, the noun *tqwh* ('hope') plays an important part in this poem; cf. above on ch. 14.[30] This repetitive, distant (!) parallelism constitutes a concatenatio of the first and the second speech-cycles. However, at the same time we can establish an important distinction between the two speeches by Job. Whereas in ch. 14 Job mainly deals with the destiny of mankind in general, in chs. 16–17 the perspective is narrowed to his own fate only. For Job, too, Sheol is a godforsaken place.

After his second reply to Eliphaz (chs. 16–17) the descriptions and characterizations of the nether world do not feature conspicuously in Job's following speeches (cf. n. 28 above). Neither do the friends take up the matter. The subject only recurs in chs. 25–26, Job's third reply to Bildad.[31] This time our attention is explicitly directed to the relationship between God and Sheol; see 26,5–7. According to those scholars who attribute these lines to one of the friends, Bildad or Zophar, they are meant to warn Job: 'There is no escape from God's presence (Ps. 139,7–8) at the utmost extremities of the universe where Job first hoped to hide from God'.[32] However, when we assume (with MT!) that these words come from Job this interpretation must be ruled out. Nevertheless, those scholars who—with MT—had attributed these lines to Job all along, did not attach any special meaning to the words. According to Budde Job declares from 26,5 onwards: 'dass er sich trotz seiner furchtbaren Anklagen die Ehrfurcht vor Gott und die Erkenntnis seines alles unendlich überragenden Wesens bewahrt hat'.[33] However, in view of Job's earlier statements about God's relationship with the realm of death such an interpretation is much too broad and vague, and overlooks the special meaning of 26,5–7 in the development of the thought-content of the dialogue. As I have demonstrated, it was precisely Job's problem that God was in no way able to reach the realm of death, that God could not make his influence felt in that region. Now it is claimed that even 'the shades have been brought forth' (26,5a)[34] and consequently the underworld is 'naked' before God, and Sheol 'has no cover' (26,6).[35] And as the parallel strophe in the first canto of the poem (25,2–3) makes clear, even God's light (!) is able to penetrate that place: 'Upon whom does his light not arise?' (25,3b). That is quite opposite to Job's previous descriptions of Sheol as 'the land of utter darkness' (10,21b). So, I think, that in the final poem of cycle II Job is convinced that even Sheol is not totally excluded from God's influence. This view does not frighten Job (cf. Peters, Habel, Parsons), nor is it meant as a general affirmation of God's greatness (cf. Budde, Weiser). The statement must be considered, in my opinion, as the comforting conclusion Job reaches in the discussion with his three friends.

---

[28] I do not take into consideration here the allusions to Sheol we find at the end of Job's second reply to Bildad (see *'pr* in 19,25b) and at the end of Job's third reply to Eliphaz (see *ḥšk // 'pl* in 23,17; cf. Job 3,6 and 10,22). Nor need we take into account the description of the fate of the wicked at the end of Job's second reply to Zophar (21,31–33), because the passage does not present a characterization of life after death.

[29] See part III, 3.

[30] Habel correctly observes that the threefold reference to 'hope' in relation to Sheol (see *'qwh* in 17,13a and *tqwty* in 17,15a–b) 'indicates that Job is reflecting on his discussion of this theme in ch. 14'; Habel (1985), p. 278. It is not permissible, in my opinion, to emend the latter instance of *tqwty* to *ṭwbty* ('my happiness'; so Pope, following LXX). The root *qwh* forms a correspondence in the first lines of the second last and last strophes of ch. 17; see part III, 3 above.

[31] See part III, 11. The friends have not touched the theme of Sheol in their speeches at all. I take this as another indication that Job is speaking in this poem.

[32] So Habel (1985), with reference to 14,13; along the same lines Dhorme (1926). Cf. also Peters with regard to 25,3 (Bildad): 'Somit ist V.3 eine scharfe Warnung an Job: Gott sieht jeden und alles und hat zahllose Mächte als Diener zur Vollziehung seines Willens zur Verfügung' (p. 271).

The conviction that the realm of the underworld is not totally deprived of God's influence is prepared by a pronouncement in the first poem of Job's first reply to Zophar (ch. 12). There it is stated in the hymnic section of canto II: 'He exposes the depth of darkness // and brings deep gloom to light' (12,22). This line already refers to 'God's control of darkness and the netherworld' (Pope; so also Dhorme and Terrien); cf. also 9,13b (and 11,8). A comparison between the poems in question (chs. 25–26 and 12) reveals that there are more similarities, some of which are quite remarkable. See, e.g., *'z* in 26,2 and 12,16; *'ṣh* in 26,3 and 12,13; *ḥkmh* in 26,3 and 12,2.12.13; *wtwšyh* in 26,3 and 12,16; *thw* in 26,7 and 12,24; *tbwnh* in 26,12 and 12,12.13; *rwḥ* in 26,13 and 12,10; *ydw* in 26,13 and 12,6.10; *drk* in 26,14 and 12,24. Hence, I will tentatively argue that there is some kind of parallelism between Job's final speeches in the first and the second cycles.[36]

---

[33] Budde (1913), p. 150; this scholar takes ch. 26 as an answer to 25,2–3. Along the same lines Weiser: 'Der Hauptteil des Kapitels (V.5–14) dient der Selbstverteidigung des Hiob gegen den Vorwurf mangelnder Ehrfurcht vor Gott, den er aus Bildads Worten herausgelesen hat' (p. 189). Otherwise Parsons: 'Because of God's sovereign comprehensive power which includes even Sheol, Job had to abandon his wish for safety in Sheol as mere fancy'; G.W. Parsons, 'The Structure and Purpose of the Book of Job', *BS* 138/551 (1981), p. 155 n. 51. On 26,5–14 see also H. Gross, 'Die Allmacht des Schöpfergottes', in *Die alttestamentliche Botschaft als Wegweisung* (Festschrift H. Reinelt), Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990, pp. 75–84; note: 'Für Ijob ist es zur Selbstverständlichkeit geworden, dass auch dieser entlegenste und verborgenste Teil des gesamten Kosmos und mit ihm alle nur vorstellbaren Bereiche der Welt Gott und seiner Mächtigkeit unterworfen sind' (p. 77).

[34] See for the translation of *yḥwllw* as 'have been brought forth' Wolfers, *art. cit.*, pp. 395–96 (with reference to 15,7).

[35] According to Wolfers, with 'him' in 26,6 Job sarcastically refers to Bildad (!; *art. cit.*, p. 396). This view is rather far-fetched. Moreover, the overall structure of the speech-cycles as described above and the linear, external parallelism between cantos I and II in chs. 25–26 (note 25,2–3) definitely speaks against this interpretation of 26,6 (and 7–14).

Habel rightly points out that the positive tone of 26,5–14 is at odds with Job's previous use of hymnic material. This observation, however, perfectly fits my supposition that we are dealing with a very special stage in the discussion between Job and his friends, namely Job's final speech in the second and last round of this discussion. In chs. 25–26 he presents a hymn about God's creative power.[37] The poem is a song of praise, in which Job acknowledges God's power to defeat the primordial chaos monsters Rahab and the Fleeing Serpent (26,12–13). This dominion of God does not end at the borders of Sheol (26,5–7). That is to say, even in the land of the dead Job will not be totally beyond God's reach. Even in the realm of chaotic forces God's light will fall upon him.[38] The poem as a whole (chs. 25–26) is 'one of the grandest recitals' of our book and 'excelled only by the Lord's speeches'.[39] Like these speeches from the whirlwind (chs. 38–41) constitute the concluding poems of my cycle III (see section 2 below), so do chs. 25–26 form the final poem of my cycle II. To my mind we have good grounds for the assumption that chs. 25–26 mark the end of an important phase in the dialogues of the book of Job. In the next section I will try to support this thesis by investigating chs. 15–26 as a self-contained speech-cycle.

---

[36] Cf. M.G. Swanepoel, 'Job 12—An(other) anticipation of the Voice from the Whirlwind?', *OTE* 4 (1991), pp. 192–205.

[37] Against Wolfers, *art. cit.*, p. 396.

[38] Cf. Amos 9,2 Ps. 139,8 Prov. 15,11 (furthermore Isa. 7,11 Hosea 13,14 Job 34,22 38,17 Sir. 42,18). See N.J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament* (Biblica et Orientalia 21), Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969, pp. 197–202; H.W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 5th edn 1990, pp. 160–66; O. Keel, *Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das Alte Testament*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 3rd edn 1984, cols. 19a–b, 39b, 40a–b and figures 43 and 46; R. Martin-Achard, *La mort en face selon la Bible Hébraïque*, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1988, pp. 83–84.

[39] So Andersen, p. 216, with regard to ch. 26. See also Gross: 'Abgesehen von den ... Aussagen über die Schöpfung, ... die in besonderer Weise den Inhalt der beiden Theophanien und der Antwortreden Gottes Ijob 38–42 prägen, gibt es kaum einen so in sich geschlossenen Text, der die unermessliche Weite, Tiefe und Höhe der göttlichen Schöpfungstat und die dahinter stehende unbegreifliche göttliche Allmacht derart kompakt zusammenschliesst und feiert wie der Hymnus Ijob 26,5–14' (*art. cit.*, p. 76).

1.3 Chs. 15–26 as a second, complete speech-cycle

According to Clines Job's speeches from chs. 16–17 onwards ‘fill out many themes already adumbrated in the earlier speeches, but they make no further logical or dramatic developments of importance’ (p. 377). This view, in my opinion, does not do justice to the facts. There is more than one indication that the poet intended to give the discussion from ch. 15 onwards a definite shape, too. This shape, however, is different from the structure of cycle I (chs. 4–14). The first cycle is constructed on a linear scheme: Eliphaz—Job (A), Bildad—Job (B), Zophar—Job (C). And as pointed out in section 1.2.1 above, the theme of the underworld according to a linear scheme comes up time and again in the last poem of Job's replies to his friends. The structure of the second cycle (chs. 15–26), however, could be described more appropriately on the basis of a concentric scheme: Eliphaz—Job (A), Bildad—Job (B), Zophar—Job (C), Eliphaz—Job (B’), Bildad—Job (A’).

With the exception of Eliphaz's third speech (ch. 22), all the speeches of the friends time and again deal with the same subject: the destruction of the wicked. Hence, the concentric structure of my second cycle most obviously comes to light when we focus on the speeches by Job himself. The speeches by Job before the nucleus of cycle II (chs. 20–21) both reflect Job's belief/hope that he will be justified by God on this side of the border of Sheol. In his second reply to Eliphaz (chs. 16–17) Job's despair reaches a climax. His petition to the earth not to cover his blood (16,18) implies that he expects to die. And his portrayal of Sheol as ‘my home’ and ‘my father’ (17,13–14) indicates ‘Job's sense of belonging to the world of Sheol’ (Clines); see also 17,1. But it is clear from v. 22 that Job does not focus upon a post-mortem vindication.[40] His utterances of black despair must urge God to interfere when he is still alive (cf. 10,20–22; note 10,21a: *bṭrm ’lk wl’ ’šwb*) and have their counterpoint in the confidence Job expresses in the famous words of 16,19–21 (note ‘*Even now* my witness is in heaven’ in 16,19a). Ch. 19, Job's second reply to Bildad, reflects the same conflict between the certainty of Job's death and his hope. Fearful that he should die before his integrity has been endorsed, he wishes his words to be preserved on a stone witness (vv. 23–24). In this way Job firmly insists on his own interpretation of the facts: he is an innocent victim. Therefore, in the following strophe he most strongly expresses his belief that he will see God (vv. 26b, 27a–b) before he dies (note '*my eyes* will see' in v. 27b).[41] In his speeches which follow the nucleus of the cycle (chs. 23 and 25–26) Job completely gives up this belief. In his third reply to Eliphaz (ch. 23) Job is desperately looking for God's face (note v. 3a) to defend his innocence (vv. 5–7 and 10–12; note v. 10b.). But he cannot find God anywhere (vv. 8–9)! In his third reply to Bildad (chs. 25–26) Job has given up the wish of meeting God while he is still alive, because even the 'face of his throne' is hidden by a cloud (26,9) which blocks the view of unclean mortals from God, just as a cloud veiled God's presence at Sinai (see part III, 11.6). He probably accepts the fact that he will die[42] and will not be vindicated by God in his lifetime. So, there is an obvious development in the thought-content of the dialogue when we compare the speeches by Job before and after his encounter with Zophar (chs. 20–21, the nucleus of the second cycle). This centre of cycle II is also marked off by a speech by Job. In this poem (ch. 21) Job for the first and the last time straightforwardly reacts to the constantly repeated statements by the friends, with which he was confronted from the first cycle onwards, concerning the destruction of the wicked.[43]

---

[40] See part III, 3.6.

Therefore the composition of our second cycle can be compared with a triptych of which the left and the right volet match each other in an antithetical way: chs. 15–19 (A-B), chs. 20–21 (C), chs. 22–26 (B'-A'). The following observations confirm this concentric structure:

(a) Job in his final poem (chs. 25–26) in a slightly modified form borrows a whole three-line strophe from the first poem of cycle II (Eliphaz's second speech) concerning human littleness when confronted with God; see 15,14–16 (A) and 25,4–6 (A').[44] Note furthermore the external parallelism *pḥd/ḥyl* in chs. 25–26 (25,2 and 26,5; A'). This parallelism forms an including chiasm with *ḥyl/pḥd* in 15,20–21 (A); the word pair does not occur elsewhere in the book of Job as far as I can see.

(b) We find the most explicit characterizations of Job's impending destiny—the realm of Sheol—in his first and last speech of the second cycle, chs. 16–17 (A) and 25–26 (A') respectively.

---

[41] See part III, 5.6

[42] Cf. W. Vogels, 'The Spiritual Growth of Job: A Psychological Approach to the Book of Job', *BTB* 11 (1981), pp. 77–80 (note column 79b).

[43] This feature is matched by the fact that the subject is most probingly dealt with in the previous speech of Zophar (ch. 20), where it is stated that the ruin of the godless is caused by God himself (20,22–23 and 27–29).

[44] Cf. part III, 11 and note *ylwd 'šh* in 15,14 and 25,4. This phenomenon at the same time forms an inclusio around cycles I and II; see 4,17–19, but cf. also part III, 1.6 (final paragraph). This inclusio is reinforced by the exclusive use of the parallelism *nšmh // rwḥ* in 4,9 and 26,4.13.

(c) There is also an obvious relationship between Job's second and second last speeches within my cycle II (chs. 19 and 23 respectively). In ch. 19 (B) Job is speaking about his conviction that he will 'see' God (19,25 27); in ch. 23 (B') he points out that he cannot 'discover' God anywhere (23,8–9). Note *'ḥz*(*h*) in 19,26b.27a and 23,9a; and *r'h* in 19,27b and 23,9b (cf. Habel, p. 350). This correspondence is another aspect of the envelope structure of cycle II.

(d) The nucleus of the cycle, chs. 20–21, is marked off by an inclusio which embraces both chapters; see the root *šwb* in 20,2a and 21,34b (cf. part III, 7.6).

For these reasons, I assume that chs. 15–26 form only one, complete speech-cycle, the structure of which can most fittingly be described by a concentric pattern—a pivot pattern—with chs. 20–21 at the nucleus of that cycle. This pattern also accounts for the fact that no third speech of Zophar is handed down to us in the book of Job. There never was such a speech because this would have destroyed the envelope structure of the second cycle.

1.4 The 270 poetic lines of cycles I and II

Especially in connection with the problematic structure of the traditionally so-called third speech-cycle (chs. 22 ff.) students of the book of Job are used to determine the scope of each cycle by means of the number of its poetic lines. According to Hontheim the poetic main body of the book of Job falls into two parts, chs. 3–22 ('Dialog') and 23–42,6 ('Monologen'); each 'Hauptteil' is supposed to comprise 510 'Zeilen', which again would fall into 300+210 'Zeilen' (chs. 4–14 and 15–22 respectively).[45] The first speech-cycle of Fohrer (chs. 3–11) contains 210 'Langverse' and his second cycle (chs. 12–20) contains 199.5 'Langverse'. The length of these cycles are more or less equated; furthermore, in both cycles the speeches of the friends span two-thirds of the length of the speeches by Job.[46] If the usually accepted demarcations of the three cycles are taken for granted, then, the figures are supposed to be 299, 186 and 155 lines respectively, according to Snaith.[47]

---

[45] Hontheim (1904), pp. 44–49. A 'Zeile' ordinarily contains two, sometimes three cola.

[46] See Fohrer (1963), pp. 107, 232 and 334.

[47] Snaith, *op. cit.*, p. 60 n. 4. Snaith himself assumes that in the first cycle (chs. 3–13) there are 277 verses and in the second cycle (14,1–21,21) there are 195 verses, whereas in chs. 21,22–27,23 there are 128 verses (Snaith, p. 60). Cf. also the figures which are stated for the individual speeches by V. Maag, *Hiob. Wandlung und Verarbeitung des Problems in Novelle, Dialogdichtung und Spätfassungen* (FRLANT 128), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck

1.4.1 THE 270 LINES OF CHS. 4–14 (CYCLE I)

An investigation made a few years ago into the formal, poetic structures of the individual poems of the first speech-cycle (chs. 4–14) as well as of the introductory poem in ch. 3, produced the following results in terms of length of the cantos of these compositions:[48] 8.9.7 (ch. 3; Job), 10.10 (ch. 4; Eliphaz), 7.9.10 1 (ch. 5; Eliphaz), 12.10.7 (ch. 6; Job), 8.8.7 (ch. 7; Job), 6.6.6.3 (ch. 8; Bildad), 11.12.11 (ch. 9; Job), 2 10.10 (ch. 10; Job), 6.6.6.2 (ch. 11; Zophar), 12.12 (ch. 12; Job), 4.12.12 (ch. 13; Job), 12.10 (ch. 14; Job).

In these calculations I make the assumption that in the book of Job every masoretic verse basically represents one poetic line, a bicolon or a tricolon. In chs. 4–14 we can distinguish 25 masoretic verses that constitute a tricolon: 4,16.19 5,5 6,4.10 7,4.11 8,6 9,24 10,1.3.15.17.22 11,20 12,3.4.6 13,27 14,5.7.12.13.14.19 (see part VI, 2.1).

In 7,20.21 and 11,6 one masoretic verse represents two poetic lines (see part II, 6 and 10 resp.).

That is to say, the total number of the lines in the first speech-cycle of the book of Job (chs. 4–14) is: 47 (Eliphaz) + 52 (Job) + 21 (Bildad) + 56 (Job) + 20 (Zophar) + 74 (Job) = **270**.

When we also include ch. 3 in our arithmetic approach, then, a striking regularity emerges as to the sum of the lines of two successive poems: 44 (chs. 3–4), 56 (chs. 5–6), 44 (chs. 7–8), 56 (chs. 9–10), 44 (chs. 11–12), 50 (chs. 13–14).

1.4.2 THE 270 LINES OF CHS. 15–26 (CYCLE II)

Among the poems of the second speech-cycle (chs. 15–26) we find some compositions which consist of bicola only, namely 15,2–16, and chs. 22 and 23. In the other poems the bicola are more or less frequently interrupted by tricola. As in cycle I we can distinguish 25 masoretic verses in the second cycle which constitute such a tricolon: 15,28.30 16,8.9.10.12.13 18,4 19,12.27.29 20,23.25.26 21,17.33 24,12.13.14.15.16.18.20.24 26,14 (see part VI, 2.1).

In 16,4 and 24,5 one masoretic verse again represents two poetic lines (see part III, 3 and 10 resp.).

On the basis of these assumptions I come to the following numbers of lines for the respective poems of the second speech-cycle: 15 (15,2–16; Eliphaz), 19 (15,17–35; Eliphaz), 38 (chs. 16–17; Job), 20 (ch. 18; Bildad),

---

& Ruprecht, 1982, p. 145 n. 424 and Hartley, pp. 25 (!), 103, 241 and 322.

[48] P. van der Lugt, *JSOT* 40 (1988), pp. 30–31; see now part VI, 1.1.

28 (ch. 19; Job), 28 (ch. 20; Zophar), 33 (ch. 21; Job), 29 (ch. 22; Eliphaz), 16 (ch. 23; Job), 26 (ch. 24; Bildad), 18 (chs. 25–26; Job); cf. part VI, 1.1. The total number of these lines is again **270**.

I consider the exactly equal number of poetic lines in chs. 4–14 (cycle I) and chs. 15–26 (cycle II),[49] and the fact that each of these speech-cycles displays 25 tricola, the ultimate proof for the present thesis that chs. 25–26 represent a crucial stage in the discussion between Job and his three friends, namely the final, concluding poem of the second speech-cycle.

---

[49] See about the number of 270 lines also section 2.6 below!

2 Job 27–28 as Job's opening speech within the third cycle

2.1 Introduction

In the preceding section I have tried to make a case for the thesis that chs. 25–26 of the book of Job constitute a concluding poem by Job at the end of the second speech-cycle. However, my new demarcation of the second cycle did not solve all the exegetical problems in chs. 24 ff. I am aiming here at the interpretation of ch. 27 and the much disputed exegesis and function of ch. 28 in the context of the poetic main body of the book of Job. We have to face the question whether it is possible to discover in these chapters points of departure for my supposition that we are dealing with the beginning of a totally new speech-cycle, cycle III. In addition, my argument with regard to chs. 25–26 as being a final, concluding poem would gain cogency if I could succeed in doing so.

At this stage of the investigation it is not very likely that I will be able to assess all the conceivable implications of my contentions. Even so, regarding the interpretation of chs. 25–26 I had to break new ground, whereas regarding the interpretation of chs. 27 and 28 previous scholars have already put forward some useful ideas which support my thesis. Although it concerns a minority of—partly somewhat conservative—exegetes, in the light of my new theory as to the delimitation of the speech-cycles, their exegesis of chs. 27 and 28 should, in my opinion, be seriously reconsidered. Therefore I will confine myself to some directive exegetical notes. I would like to discuss, then, the following aspects of chs. 27 and 28:

- chs. 27 and 28 together constitute a speech by Job which has to clear the way for the discussion between Job and God;
- this speech is composed of two relatively independent poems, each with its own function: (a) the first poem, ch. 27, definitively intends to show that the arguments of the 'friends' did not contribute anything to solve Job's problem; (b) the second poem, ch. 28, is a testimony of Job's despair.

2.2 The identity of the wicked in ch. 27

In part IV, 1.6 it was concluded that ch. 27 as a whole is a well constructed poem, which can only come from Job. On the basis of the rhetorical structure of the first canto (vv. 2–13) I have deduced that in v. 7 Job accuses his former 'friends' of being his 'enemies' (note *'yb* in v. 7a) and curses them with the fate of the wicked. The portrayal of the wicked in canto II (vv. 14–23) —which is very similar to large portions of the speeches by Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar—functions here as a warning and accusation in the direction of the friends themselves. They are written off by Job for good now. At first sight Job uses bold words here. The 'audience', namely, will realize that Job's words perfectly fit his own fate! At the same time, therefore, the poem is an exquisite testimony of the self-contradictory situation in which Job finds himself. And as the following poem explicitly makes clear, Job is aware of this fact too. It cannot be denied though, that there exists some tension between Job's statement of 27,14–23 and his description of the prosperous life of the wicked in ch. 21.[1]

2.3 The function of the quest for wisdom in ch. 28

The meaning of ch. 28 and its function within the poetic main body of the book of Job is one of the most disputed topics relating to this large-scale composition. It is a fairly common tradition among scholars to take this chapter as an isolated poem. And it is often maintained in this connection that the poem is totally out of place in the book of Job, and certainly does not fit the context where we find it in MT.[2] Three main arguments are put forward to support this radical position: (a) the conception of wisdom we find in ch. 28 is rather unique in the book of Job; (b) the calm and resigned tone in which it is argued that wisdom is unattainable for mankind makes the answer of God from the whirlwind (chs. 38 ff.) superfluous; (c) from a psychological point of view this calm tone makes Job's renewed outburst in chs. 29–31 incomprehensible (Driver-Gray, Fohrer). However, we also find the opinion that ch. 28 as an independent poem was originally placed between chs. 27 and 29 by the poet himself with a very deliberate purpose.[3] Probably to meet the third objection mentioned above, it is often stressed that we are not dealing with the words of Job himself but that we have to take the poem as a concluding or bridging meditation (!) by the author of our book.[4]

---

[1] See about this 'contradiction' section 2.5.3 below.

[2] So Duhm (1897), Driver-Gray (1921), Weiser (1968), Hölscher (1952), Fohrer (1963), Pope (1973), Müller (1978). See also J. Lévêque, *Job et son Dieu*, 2 vols. (Études Bibliques), Paris: Gabalda, 1970, pp. 594–95; V. Maag, *Hiob, Wandlung und Verarbeitung des Problems in Novelle, Dialogdichtung und Spätfassungen* (FRLANT 128), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982, pp. 149 and 195; J. Vermeylen, *Job, ses amis et son dieu* (Studia Biblica 2), Leiden: Brill, 1986, pp. 13 and 28; and C.C. Settlemire, 'The Original Position of Job 28', in: H.D. Thompson (ed.), *The Answers Lie Below: Essays in honor of L.E. Toombs*, Lanham (Maryland): University Press of America, 1984, pp. 287–317 (note pp. 298–99). Settlemire argues that ch. 28 as a song of praise was originally placed after Job's confession in 42,2–6.

[3] According to Dhorme (1926), Gordis (1978) and Van Selms (1983) this was done by the poet in a later stage.

In my opinion, there is no need to doubt that we are dealing with Job's own words and to call into question that the heading of the preceding poem—'and Job again took up his discourse, and said' (27,1)—is also operative for ch. 28.[5] From this perspective I will comment on the three objections mentioned above. I start with the objections last named about the supposedly calm and resigned tone of ch. 28.

There is no reason to emphasize the calm and resigned tone of ch. 28, or to designate the poem as a kind of meditation; neither would it be correct to call it a 'hymn to wisdom'.[6] The composition of the poem reveals a stable construction. We can distinguish three cantos of eight lines each (vv. 5–12, 13–20, and 21–28), which are introduced by a unit of four lines (vv. 1–4). The end of the cantos is marked off by a refrain that clearly expresses the theme of the poem.[7] Mankind is able to reach all kinds of hidden treasures in the earth (vv. 5–11), but 'wisdom' is unattainable for him: vv. 12, 20 and 28. This refrain reveals that Job is desperately looking here for 'wisdom' (*ḥkmh*) and 'understanding' (*bynh*). The repeated questions *m'yn* ... *w'y zh* in vv. 12 and 20 characterize the poem as a *litany-like lament* rather than as a hymn.[8] Dhorme has struck the right note when he writes: 'Et mélancoliquement l'auteur ajoute ce refrain, qui reparaîtra un peu plus loin, à peine modifié' (p. XLI). The second canto as a whole (vv. 13–20) is marked by the repetition of the adverb *l'* (see also *'yn* in v. 14b).[9] This negation is typical for the tone which characterizes the whole poem. The concluding refrain (v. 28) does not really give the composition a twist.[10] When it is maintained in this line that, as far as man is concerned, the fear of the LORD is 'wisdom' and shunning evil yields 'understanding', we have to take into account that these words have a hidden meaning. At first sight we are dealing with a resigned declaration of piety by Job.[11] In the context of our book as a whole, however, v. 28 has a negative ring to it.

---

[4] So Dhorme, Westermann (1978, p. 133), Kroeze, Epping-Nelis, Andersen, Gordis, Van Selms, Habel, and Hartley. See also Lévêque, *op. cit.*, p. 600; R. Laurin, 'The Theological Structure of Job', *ZAW* 84 (1972), p. 88; J.F.A. Sawyer, 'The Authorship and Structure of the Book of Job', in: *Studia Biblica 1978: I O.T.* (JSOTS 11), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979, p. 255; J. Zamodi, 'The Wisdom Hymn (28) and Its Place in the Book of Job', *Beth Mikra* 94 (1983), pp. 268–77; E.B. Smick, 'Architectonics, Structured Poems, and Rhetorical Devices in the Book of Job', in: W.C. Kaiser and R.F. Youngblood (eds.), *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1986, pp. 88 and 90; S.A. Geller, ' "Where is Wisdom?": A Literary Study of Job 28 in its Settings', in: J. Neusner e.a. (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987, p. 174.

[5] This opinion—that ch. 28 represents Job's own words—appears to be rather antiquated nowadays. The poem was lastly interpreted so by Fine (1955), Möller (1955) and Settlemire (*art. cit.*); see also G.W. Parsons, 'The Structure and Purpose of the Book of Job', *BS* 138/551 (1981), p. 152 n. 12 (!); so previously by Schlottmann (1851), Ewald (1854), Delitzsch (1876), Budde (1882 and 1913), Dillmann (1891), Hontheim (1904), Régnier (1924), Peters (1928), and König (1929). See also Vetter (1897, p. 46).

[6] This last designation we find in the commentaries by Dillmann, Hontheim, Peters (note pp. 48 and 50), Epping-Nelis, Gordis, Hartley. See also Laurin, *art. cit.*, p. 86; Sawyer, *art. cit.*, p. 255; and Settlemire, *art. cit.*, pp. 305–11.

[7] See for the structural analysis of this chapter P. van der Lugt, 'The Form and Function of the Refrains in Job 28', in: W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 265–93 and cf. now part IV, 2 above.

[8] In this composition there is a total absence of participles which are typical of a

The negative tone of especially the concluding refrain in 28,28 was first explained by Budde. Indirectly, according to Budde, the line contains an 'Anklage Gottes'[12] because 'Hiobs eigenes Beispiel beweist, dass die Gottesfurcht noch kein Bürgschaft für Glück gewährt'.[13] 'Hiob bleibt nach wie vor vor dem ungelösten Räthsel stehen und zwar ohne sich zu unterwerfen und ohne Verzicht zu leisten auf die Lösung desselben, die er ungestüm von Gott verlangt'.[14] In his commentary on the book of Job (1913) Budde did not depart from this exegesis of ch. 28. Very few scholars, however, have followed his lead. I can only point here to Régnier (1924) and Habel (1985). According to Régnier 28,28 'contient une réflexion amère', and 'quand il

---

hymn (Van Selms). The parallelism of the interrogatives (*m'yn // w'y zh*) creates an allusion to the repeated questions which are put by God to Satan in the prologue: *m'yn tb'* ('Whence do you come?', 1,7; cf. 28,20a) and *'y mzh tb'* ('Whence do you come?', 2,2). Does this allusion suggest God's relative 'failure' to control evil, just like Job's relative 'failure' to reach wisdom?

[9] See Geller, *art. cit.*, pp. 165 and 168–69.

[10] See for v. 28 as an integral part of the poem of ch. 28 part IV, 2.6.

[11] Some scholars take this superficial interpretation of v. 28 as the leading idea of the whole poem; so Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Peters, Fine, Snaith, Settlemire (*art. cit.*, pp. 291–92, 302–05, 312–13), and Hartley.

[12] So K. Budde, 'Die Kapitel 27 und 28 des Buches Hiob', *ZAW* 2 (1882), p. 263.

[13] Budde, *art. cit.*, p. 262. Cf. also: 'Der schmerzliche Eindruck dieser Worte wird nur verschärft durch den Umstand, dass sie eine scheinbar leise Umbildung und Umbeugung eines bekannten, zugleich mahnenden und tröstenden Wortes sind, von dessen Wahrheit auch Hiob früher gewiss überzeugt gewesen ist: dass man durch Gottesfurcht zur Weisheit gelangen könne. Mich dünkt, hier hat jedes Wort seinen Stachel; die Antwort des Gottes, der, selbst im Besitze der Weisheit, dem Menschen sagen wollte: "sie ist nicht für Dich, Du hast Dich nur mir unbedingt anzuvertrauen", könnte nicht schroffer gefasst werden, als es hier geschehen ist' (Budde, *art. cit.*, p. 265). Budde himself indicates that this opinion contradicts the exegesis of nearly all other scholars (p. 256).

[14] Budde, *art. cit.*, p. 267–68. Möller opposes Budde's opinion that in v. 28 mankind is fobbed off by God with an 'Ersatzweisheit' (p. 64); so also Driver-Gray and Kroeze (p. 21; contra Budde [1913], pp. 162, 163, and 170).

s'agit de l'homme, la sagesse n'est que un succédané'.[15] The full significance of this poem, according to Habel, is only evident 'when due consideration is given to the closing verse (v. 28)' (p. 392). 'Fear' and 'shunning evil', Habel stresses, 'has not provided Job with the wisdom to understand the crisis he faced' (p. 392). Habel furthermore points out: 'The model for fearing God seems to be the patriarchal Job of the narrative prologue. For he it is who "shuns evil" and therefore has "discernment." But that model of Job is in conflict with the Job of the preceding dialogue. The significance of this verse lies in the function of this counterpoint within the design of the book of Job' (p. 401).[16]

The definition of wisdom in v. 28 contains a deliberate allusion to the prologue where Job is described as *yr' 'lhym* ('fearing God') and *sr mr'* ('shunning evil';[17] 1,1.8 and 2,3). But this attitude did not provide Job with the wisdom to understand his present sufferings. So, as a matter of fact, ch. 28 is an extensive demonstration of Job's failing to attain the wisdom, which he so badly needs in his present circumstances.[18]

If I have succeeded in showing that the tone of ch. 28 is basically anything but calm and resigned and that the poem indirectly accuses God of withholding Job a satisfactory answer to the question why he has to suffer, then, the second and the third objections mentioned above become invalid. That is to say, ch. 28 can be interpreted in the progression of the thought-content of our book. Even so, it may be observed that unlike the preceding dialogue, the poem is 'not argumentative and reveals no echo of a passionate debate' (Gordis, p. 298). But this need not surprise us after Job has written off his partners in dialogue for good in ch. 27. True, we could expect now on the basis of Job's speeches in cycle I some kind of lament, in which Job addresses himself to God. We must realize, however, that—according to my thesis—we are dealing with a completely new speech-cycle. And one cannot simply compare the inner structure of the speeches of this cycle with those of the preceding cycles.[19]

---

[15] Note M.A. Régnier, 'La distribution des chapitres 25–28 du livre de Job', *RB* 33 (1924), pp. 198–200. According to Weiser ch. 28 is 'eine spätere Ergänzung der Hiobdichtung ... um ... die Bankerotterklärung der menschlichen Weisheit gegenüber der Hiobfrage zu unterstreichen' (p. 198). Curiously, however, Weiser gives a positive interpretation of v. 28 and draws a parallel between chs. 28 and 38 ff. (pp. 200–01).

[16] Habel does not appeal to Budde, although to some degree he obviously concurs with Budde's 'self-willed' exegesis of ch. 28. On the other hand, Habel describes the tone of the poem as 'measured, lyrical and controlled' after the preceding verbose dialogues. On this basis he considers the chapter as the poet's personal reflection on the debate thus far (p. 392). Cf. also Laurin, *art. cit.*, p. 88, and: 'Chapter 28 provides the doctrine which Job had heard since childhood "by the hearing of the ear," and which was the cause *by itself* of Job's despair' (p. 89). According to Westermann (1978) ch. 28 cannot represent the climax of the book of Job, 'dies schon wegen seiner Stellung *vor* der grossen Schlussklage nicht' (p. 131). The chapter 'steht in scharfem Kontrast zum Lob der Weisheit etwa in Prov 1–9. ... die Weisheit lässt sich nicht erwerben!' (p. 132). However, Westermann takes v. 28 as a 'korrigierender Zusatz' (p. 133 n. 1) and denies that the poem could be a speech by Job (p. 131). Cf. also H.-P. Müller (1978), p. 133 ('Skepsis von Hiob 28').

[17] Cf. A. Hurvitz, *VT*, 38 (1988), pp. 47–49.

[18] Budde (1913) rightly points out: 'Der einzige Zweck, für den im Buche Hiob nach Weisheit und Erkenntnis ... gesucht wird, ist die Hiob und den Freunden vorliegende Frage, woher Hiobs Leiden komme' (p. 162); see also Budde (1882), pp. 248–53.

As to the objection first mentioned above, we actually must admit that some discrepancy between the conception of wisdom in ch. 28 and the preceding chapters cannot be ignored. The discussions between Job and his three friends could be described as a struggle with regard to the question which camp is in the possession of 'wisdom'. The friends had claimed wisdom indirectly for themselves (5,12–14 8,8–10 11,5–6 15,2–3.7–8.17–19), and Job had ridiculed them precisely for that reason (12,2–3.11–13 13,5–6 17,9–10 26,2–4). The 'wisdom' concerned, however, was directly related to the explanation of Job's suffering. But the wisdom with which the greater part of ch. 28 is concerned is 'the knowledge of the principles by which both the phenomena of the physical world (cf. Prov. 3,19–20) and the events of human life are regulated' (Driver-Gray I, p. 234). This wisdom is a 'neben Gott stehende, selbständige Grösse', a 'hypostasis' (cf. Prov. 1–9 Sir. 24 Bar. 3–4 Sap. 7–8; note Hölscher, pp. 68–69), or something like 'eine numinose Materie' which could be compared with the impersonal Egyptian *maat*, especially with the Sumerian *me*.[20] Although the closing verse-line of ch. 28 (v. 28) proves that in the Hebrew world of thought there was not an absolute contradiction between the more or less philosophical conception of wisdom (28,1–27) and the practical interpretation of it (v. 28),[21] we cannot close our eyes to the fact that in ch. 28 we find an extensive working-out of exactly the theoretical conception of wisdom. However, the tension which is created in this way between ch. 28 and the preceding discussions, ch. 28 shares with the preceding poem in ch. 27 (see section 2.2 above). In my opinion, this is just another indication to confirm my thesis about the relative independence of the third speech-cycle.[22]

---

[19] See for a further demonstration of this statement section 2.5.3 below.

[20] So H.-P. Müller (1978), p. 132 (cf. also p. 131!), who follows Fohrer (pp. 394–95). See also A. Niccacci, 'Giobbe 28', *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Liber Annuus* 31 (1981), pp. 29–58.

[21] Cf. Snaith (1968), pp. 67–68 and 70; Geller, *art. cit.*, p. 170. See, e.g., Job 12,11–13 and 21,22–24. It is saying a lot that those scholars who take ch. 28 as a later insertion in the book of Job, generally feel urged to skip v. 28 (cf. part IV, 2.6). Weiser is an exception to this rule. Note also that Westermann considers ch. 28 as an integral part of our book; see furthermore Geller, *art. cit.*.

2.4 The relationship between chs. 27 and 28 in the context of the book of Job

I will try to make clear now that chs. 27 and 28 can be interpreted as one coherent speech by Job at the beginning of a new speech-cycle. Several attempts have already been made in the past to determine the relationship between both poems.[23] Delitzsch's solution as to the 'äussere und innere Zusammenhang' of both chapters is formulated as follows:

> 'Iob hat den Gottlosen als einen habgierigen Reichen geschildert, der seinem maßlosen Besitze von Silber und Kostbarkeiten durch plötzlichen Tod entrissen wird, und begründet nun dieses Strafgerichtsbild in folgender Weise: Silber und andere edle Metalle stammen aus den Tiefen der Erde, die Weisheit aber, deren Werth alle diese irdischen Schätze übersteigt, ist nirgends innerhalb des Bereichs der Creatur zu finden' (p. 354).

By making use of the noun *ksp* ('silver') in its first colon, ch. 28 naturally ties in with 27,16–17, where we find the same noun.[24] According to Peters it is especially the noun *mqwm* ('place') which constitutes the formal and thematic linkage between both chapters. From God's place descends punishment for the wicked (27,23; cf. also *mqwm* in 27,21) and blessing (namely wisdom) for the good ones (see 28,12.20.23; cf. also *mqwm* in 28,1.6).[25] *ky* in 28,1 is interpreted by Peters as the introduction to the second motivation by Job about the question why he holds on to his fear of God (cf. *ky* in 27,8). However, there are no indications in ch. 28 that Job is addressing his friends as he was in the preceding poem (see 27,5 and 11–12). Therefore we are not forced to look for such direct, logical connections as Delitzsch and Peters try to establish.

There is still another verbal repetition which marks chs. 27 and 28 off as an indissoluble unity. The poet of these chapters has made a conspicuous use of the root *swr* (qal 'to turn aside out of one's course'; hiph'il 'to take away, remove’). We only find this verb in the opening lines of the first and the second strophes of ch. 27 (vv. 2 and 5), and in the closing line of ch. 28. God ‘has taken away’ (*ḥsyr*) Job’s right (27,2), but Job will ‘depart from’ (*sr*) evil (28,28) and not ‘give up’ (*’syr*) his integrity (27,5). In this way both poems are held together by an obvious, formal and thematic inclusio, which aims at emphazising Job’s *innocence*.

---

[22] See section 2.5.3 below.

[23] The chapters are treated as one speech by Job in the commentaries of Schlottmann, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Peters, König. See also Vetter (1897, pp. 46–47), Régnier, Fine, and Möller.

[24] Delitzsch (1876), p. 354 (see also p. 359). It is a matter of fact that we do not find this noun in the surrounding chapters; see also 3,15 22,25 31,39 and 28,15.

[25] Peters (1928), pp. 293–94. It is again a matter of fact that we do not find this noun in the surrounding chapters; cf. 18,4.21 20.9 on the one hand, and 34,26 37,1 38,12 and 19 on the other hand.

In this connection I refer to an important observation made by Fine. This scholar, too, tries to show that chs. 27 and 28 ‘constitute a unit’. He points out that just like 28,28 (see section 2.3 above) also 27,5b 6a contains an allusion to the prologue. The cola in question *‘d ’gw‘ l’ ’syr tmty mmny* (‘till I die I will not give up my integrity’) and *bṣdqty hḥzqty wl’ ’rph* (‘I hold on to my righteousness and will not yield’)—27,5b and 6a respectively—are an echo of some key phrases in the prologue, namely *‘dnw mḥzyq btmtw* (‘he still holds on to his integrity’, 2,3) and *‘dk mḥzyq btmtk* (‘do you still hold on to your integrity’, 2,9). Fine rightly points out: ‘Only here, in all the central chapters of the dialogues, do we find the echo of this key phrase of the prologue’.[26] That is to say, ch. 27 as well as ch. 28 explicitly refer to the opening chapters of the book of Job with respect to the justice and integrity of our hero. This joint reference point is another indication for the cohesion of both poems.[27]

The declaration of Job’s innocence in chs. 27 (and 28) is put in a very specific context and therefore has a hidden meaning (see especially section 2.3 above). Hence, we cannot draw an exact parallel between the description of Job’s behaviour in chs. 1–2 on the one hand and chs. 27–28 on the other. We are no longer dealing with the patient Job of the prologue when in 27,2 Job blames God for ‘depriving him of his rights’ and ‘making his soul bitter’. The same phenomenon can be observed in ch. 28, where Job is desperately looking for wisdom.[28] When Job in chs. 27–28 in this specific way links up with some key phrases from the prologue I consider this phenomenon as a confirmation of my thesis, that chs. 27–28 are the beginning of a new speech-cycle. The allusions to the prologue are fraught with bitter irony. Chs. 27–28 do not merely reflect the portrayal of Job's patience in chs. 1–2, but are a testimony of the accusing and confused Job of chs. 3 ff., too. In this singular way chs. 27–28 (once again) try to demonstrate the highly ambivalent situation in which Job finds himself. I get the impression that the poet is making an attempt to reformulate the problem of Job's inexplicable, undeserved sufferings.[29]

---

[26] H.A. Fine, ‘The tradition of a patient Job’, *JBL* 74 (1955), p. 30. See also Habel, p. 378!

[27] See also n. 8 above about the parallelism *m’yn // w’y zh* in 28,12 and 20 and the allusion of this parallelism to the prologue.

[28] This specific context of the allusions concerned in chs. 27–28 is totally overlooked by Fine when he emphasizes that in chs. 27–28 Job is not the hero who defies God. Fine takes these chapters as pious words, in which Job preaches the virtue of submission to the will of God. Fine has to conclude, then, that the chapters involved are separate from the main body of the dialogues. Furthermore, he supposes an impious advice of Job’s friends: ‘Look about you at the prosperity of the wicked and the misfortunes of the righteous’ (*art. cit.*, p. 29); cf. Dillmann (1891), p. 238! However, there is no single indication in our book that the friends should ever have spoken such words.

My observations are confirmed by the heading of ch. 27. It is already indicated in MT that from 27,2 onwards we are dealing with a special kind of continuation to the earlier speeches of Job. Whereas the preceding speeches of Job time and again are introduced by the formula *wy'n 'ywb wy'mr* ('then Job said in reply') the heading of ch. 27 (just like that of ch. 29; cf. 36,1) abruptly runs as follows: *wysp 'ywb ś't mšlw wy'mr* ('and Job again took up his discourse and said'). Fine correctly notes that the editors of the book of Job must have had some knowledge of the 'separate origin and function' of chs. 27–28.[30] The new formula marks the chapters off from the preceding dialogue.[31] In connection with the traditional attempt to reconstruct the third speech-cycle, however, it is generally maintained that 27,1 is a late, editorial addition.[32] Even Budde overlooked the true meaning of the special introduction to ch. 27. He takes this chapter as the answer to the second part of Bildad's speech in ch. 25 (namely vv. 4–6), 'trotz der neuen Überschrift in v. 1, die mit ihrem *wysp* zwar nicht geradezu störend, aber doch überflüssig ist'.[33]

Our poet, however, wanted to add a wholly new speech-cycle to the already existing cycles I and II, and in connection with this aim he had to solve a difficult problem. Cycles I and II, namely, are already rounded off with some kind of conclusion: chs. 25–26 (see section 1 above). The poet was obliged, therefore, to stress the disappointing result of the previous discussions. And he has performed his task in a very well thought-out way. As I have tried to show in the previous section, in chs. 25–26 we find Job's answer to the question of God's influence in the underworld. Job was especially wrestling with this question in the poems in which he addresses himself to God. The poet of cycle III does not try to interfere with the answer Job had discovered for himself, but he ties in with the conflict between Job and his three friends. This conflict, indeed, did not come to a satisfactory solution. In ch. 27 the poet makes the most of this opportunity to open a new speech-cycle. He makes his hero definitely settle scores with his partners in dialogue of cycles I–II.[34] In the centre of cycle II (ch. 21) Job had already plainly dissociated himself from the *theology* of his friends with regard to the fate of the wicked (see part III, 7). Now, in ch. 27 these friends are straightforwardly attacked in their *own person* (note 'my enemies' in 27,7a). Not only their ideas are rejected by Job, but they themselves are indirectly labelled as godless people (27,7)! Ch. 28 almost seamlessly links up with the preceding poem. When the friends with their expositions about the futureless state of the wicked did not contribute anything to solve Job's problem about his own sufferings, then, for the time being—as the poet emphasizes in ch. 28—Job is again totally thrown upon his own resources. In this poem Job is no longer engaged in a polemic with his three friends, and not (yet!) in a controversy with God. The poem is a monologue! Insofar the tone of the poem could be characterized as 'calm', but it is the calm before 'the storm' ....[35]

---

[29] Hence, I do not agree with those scholars who interpret 1,1 and 28,28 as an inclusio, 'which suggests that the book should be divided into Part I and Part II at this point' (Andersen, p. 224). In the same way Habel; cf. Peters (1928), p. 309. In my opinion, 27,5b–6a and 28,28 together constitute a *linear* correspondence with 1,1.8 and 2,3 at the beginning of the 'original' design of the book of Job and the subsequent attempt to give a more satisfying answer to the problem of undeserved suffering of mankind.

[30] Fine, *art. cit.*, p. 32.

[31] Cf. Andersen, p. 219. See also Möller, who concludes on the basis of the introductory formula: 'jetzt legt er [Hiob] seinen Standpunkt kurz konzentriert dar' (p. 61), and D. Wolfers, 'The speech-cycles in the book of Job', *VT* 43 (1993), p. 402.

[32] So recently Hartley (1988), who supposes that the words were put here secondarily 'to indicate that Job continues to speak because Zophar remained silent' (p. 368); see also Snaith (1968), p. 62, among others.

[33] Budde, *art. cit.*, p. 196; cf. Régnier, *art. cit.*, p. 191. See also Budde (1913), p. 155, where he plainly states that 27,1 is to be deleted; so also Weiser. As I have pointed out in part III, 11, ch. 25 is to be considered as part of a speech by Job; therefore, ch. 27 cannot be an answer to 25,4–6. Cf. also Möller's third objection to this reconstruction by Budde; see Möller (1955), p. 62.

---

[34] Cf. Parsons, *art. cit.*, pp. 140–41.

[35] Weiser correctly observes: 'Rückblickend zieht Kapitel 28 den Schlußstrich unter alle Versuche, den geheimen Sinn des Hiobleidens von der Weisheit her zu ergründen' (pp. 200–01). Hence, the particle *ky*, introducing ch. 28, does not merely link up with ch. 27, but 'begründet die von Hiob während des ganzen Streites unerschütterlich behauptete, in c. 27 durch Darlegung seiner eigenen zerrissenen Geistesverfassung kundgegebene Behauptung, dass sein Leiden, als von Gott herrührend, ein für Menschen unlösbares Räthsel sei'; Budde (1882), p. 255; cf. also Budde (1913), p. 163. In this light the question whether we have to translate *ky* in 28,1 with Budde and Möller (p. 65) as a causative ('because'), or with Weiser, Gordis (!), Habel, Hartley, NBG, RSV as an asseverative particle ('truly') becomes of secondary importance.

2.5 The structure of the third speech-cycle

2.5.1 THE STRUCTURE OF THE THIRD SPEECH-CYCLE

There is no discussion among scholars as to the structure and speaker of chs. 29–31. We are dealing here with a speech by Job, which displays a very transparent make up. The chapter divisions clearly correspond to the three sections of the speech: in ch. 29 Job portrays his former blessings and prestige; in ch. 30 he contrasts his former position with the present afflictions by which he is harmed by God and man; in ch. 31 we find Job's final, wide-ranging oath of innocence (cf. part IV, 3.6). Chs. 29–31 are often considered as a soliloquy. But that term only fits ch. 29. The poems of chs. 30 and 31 have an addressee, namely God. In 30,20–23 God is addressed in the second person and 31,35–37 represent Job's challenging his adversary to make his appearance in court. That is to say chs. 29–31 show the same characteristics as do chs. 27–28. We note the following features: (a) both speeches are introduced by the deviant heading *wysp 'ywb ś't mšlw wy'mr*; (b) both speeches are a reformulation of Job's problem (chs. 29–31 more explicitly so than chs. 27–28);[36] (c) both speeches are composed of a soliloquy by Job and one or two poems with a distinct addressee (the friends and God respectively); (d) in both speeches stress is laid on Job's purity.[37]

So, my third cycle opens with *two* speeches by Job. These two speeches form a perfect, complete whole. In ch. 27 Job first draws up the balances of the dialogue with his friends. In chs. 30–31 Job finally makes an attempt to move his heavenly adversary to provide him with an answer. The poems in-between (chs. 28–29) are a soliloquy. They constitute the natural stepping stone from the first to the second speech. There is a substantial thread running from ch. 27, where Job definitively washes his hands of his 'friends', to chs. 30–31, where Job for the last time addresses himself to God. The poet takes a long time in coming to his point, because both speeches together can be taken as one large-scale challenge to Job's proper adversary. And this time Job's challenge does not remain unanswered! The *two* speeches by Job are matched by *two* speeches from the whirlwind, chs. 38–39 and 40,6–41,26. These two speeches by God are introduced by the same headings: *wy'n yhwh 't 'ywb mn (h)s'rh wy'mr* ('then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind', 38,1 and 40,6; cf. 27,1 and 29,1). So, the integrity of the *two* speeches from the whirlwind is also confirmed by the structure of the third speech-cycle.[38]

---

[36] Cf. Schlottmann (1851), p. 386.

[37] Because ch. 31 is preceded by a description of the contradiction between Job's former and present situation, his oath of purity again contains an accusation of God, just like Job's declaration of innocence in chs. 27–28; see section 2.4 above and Parsons, *art. cit.*, pp. 217–18. Kutsch does not sufficiently take into account this specific context of ch. 31 when he compares the relationship between chs. 31 and 38 ff. with ch. 125 of the Egyptian so-called 'Book of the Dead' and with texts like Pss. 15 24 Isa. 33,10–16 Mi. 6,6–8; see E. Kutsch, 'Unschuldsbekenntnis und Gottesbegegnung. Der Zusammenhang zwischen Hiob 31 und 38 ff.', in: L. Schmidt and K. Eberlein (eds.), *Kleine Schriften zum Alten Testament* (BZAW 168), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1986, pp. 308–35 (note pp. 330–35).

The speech-cycle as a whole is demarcated by signs of 'inclusio'. There are indications, namely, that chs. 38–41 contain some deliberate allusions to the poem about the quest for wisdom in ch. 28. See *bny šḥṣ* in 28,8 and 41,26 (†), *ḥkmh // bynh* in 28,12.20.28 and 38,36 39,17, *'y zh mqwm* in 28,12.20 and 38,19 (cf. 38,24), *thwm // ym* and *ym // thwm* in 28,14 and 38,16 resp., *tḥt kl hšmym* in 28,24 and 41,3, *wdrk lḥzyz qlwt* in 28,26 and 38,25 (†).[39] I conclude that the third cycle as a whole displays a stable construction.[40]

2.5.2 THE ORIGINAL POSITION OF 40,1–5

Unlike the speeches by Job, the speeches from the whirlwind do not immediately follow each other in MT. These latter speeches are separated by 40,1–5. Some scholars, in one way or another, try to integrate the very concise speech by God in 40,2 with the context of the preceding speech from the whirlwind (see Köster, Ley, TOB, Hartley in part IV, 7.5; and Delitzsch, Van Selms, Habel in part III, 12.5). This makes it very difficult, however, to give a satisfactory explanation of the heading in 40,1.[41]

The heading *wy'n yhwh 't 'ywb wy'mr* ('and the LORD said in reply to Job') is very similar to the headings in my first and second speech-cycles. Moreover, the use of the verb *mwkyḥ* (‘the one arraigning’, 40,2b) is an indication that God's ‘reply’ to Job in 40,2 ties in with cycles I–II. The root *ykḥ* (hiph‘il ‘to reprove’), namely, does not occur in my third cycle, but frequently does in the discussions between Job and his friends (and twice in the Elihu-speeches: 32,12 and 33,19 [hoph‘al]).[42] We especially come across this root in the speeches by Job himself: 6,25–26 9,33 13,3.6.10.15 (cycle I); 16,21 19,5 23,4.7 (cycle II). Furthermore, the root occurs once in each of the Eliphaz-speeches: 5,17 (cycle I); 15,3 22,4 (cycle II). When Job in 40,2 is designated by God as *mwkyḥ ʾlwh*, then, this qualification seamlessly fits the last use of the root *ykḥ* in cycle II, 23,4 and 7. There, Job imagines that he will take up his position ‘to argue’ with God.[43] Cf. also *mh ʾšybk* (‘what can I answer You’, 40,4a) with *wmy yšybnw* (‘who can answer Him’, 23,13a); see furthermore 9,12 11,10 and 31,14 (!).

---

[38] The integrity of the JHWH-speeches is also established by a structural analysis of the speeches themselves; see part IV, 6–8.

[39] See for these correspondences Dhorme (p. LXXVI) and Settlemire, *art. cit.*, p. 296; cf. also Lévêque (1970, p. 599).

[40] I join the great majority of critics who regard the Elihu speeches as an 'inconvenient' insertion between chs. 31 and 38. So recently T. Mende, *Durch Leiden zur Vollendung. Die Elihureden im Buch Ijob (Ijob 32–37)* (Trierer Theologische Studien 49), Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1990; and H.-M. Wahl, *Der gerechte Schöpfer. Eine redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung der Elihureden* (BZAW 207), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993. Otherwise recently Snaith (1968, pp. 72–91), Andersen, Gordis, Habel (pp. 36–37), Hartley (pp. 28–30). See also S. Bakon, 'The Enigma of Elihu', *Dor le Dor* 12 (1983–84), pp. 217–28; D. Wolfers, 'Elihu: The Provenance and Content of His Speech', *Dor le Dor* 16 (1987–88), pp. 90–98; J.B. Curtis, 'Why Were the Elihu Speeches Added to the Book of Job?', *PEGLMBS* 8 (1988), pp. 93–99.

[41] So also J. van Oorschot, *Gott als Grenze. Eine literar- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Gottesreden des Hiobbuches* (BZAW 170), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987, pp. 12 and 157.

Hence, I think, we have to take 40,1–5 as the original ‘conclusion’ to the cycles I–II. The discussion between Job and his three friends was actually rounded off, then, with a one-line revelation (40,2) and a brief answer by Job (40,4–5). The poet of my third cycle had to take away this conclusion from its original position, because the heading of the first speech in this round (*wysp ʾywb* ..., 27,1) would constitute an inexplicable contradiction to Job's last words (... *wlʾ ʾwsyp*, 40,5). In its present position 40,1–5 slightly balances 42,1–6. Nevertheless, 40,1–5 unnecessarily interrupts the first and the second answer from the whirlwind.[44]

2.5.3 CYCLE III AS A RELATIVELY INDEPENDENT DIALOGUE

Finally, I will point out the most obvious differences between speech-cycles I and II on the one hand and cycle III on the other hand:

1. In the first place, unlike the first and the second speech-cycle, cycle III does not display a regular alternation of speech and counter-speech. In cycles I and II the speeches of the friends are time and again

---

[42] Cf. S.H. Scholnick, ‘Poetry in the Courtroom: Job 38–41’, in Elaine R. Follis, *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (JSOTS 40), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987, esp. pp. 186–87. See for the forensic meaning of the root *ykḥ* (hiph‘il) Van Oorschot, *op. cit.*, pp. 152–53.

[43] Parsons (*art. cit.* p. 218) takes the usage of *mwkyḥ* in 40,2 as an ‘implicit reference to Job's hypothetical *mwkyḥ*’ in 9,33. Van Oorschot argues that 40,2 is formally and thematically related to 40,8 and originally must have preceded this line (*op. cit.*, pp. 12–14 and 151–55). The context of 40,8, however, does not point to a legal procedure, but obviously has in mind a wrestling match (note 40,7a; but also vv. 9–14).

[44] In fact, 40,4–5 also excludes Job's reply in 42,1–6; see Driver-Gray, Kutsch (*art. cit.*, p. 315), Van Oorschot (*op. cit.*, pp. 14 and 156).

interrupted by a speech of Job. In the third cycle we essentially find only one large speech (Job) and one large counter-speech (God).

2. In cycles I and II the speeches of the friends come first, in cycle III the speeches of Job precede.

3. The poems of the third cycle are generally more long-winded than the poems of cycles I and II. Chs. 27 ff. are characterized by the fact that they extensively deal with one single theme: wisdom (ch. 28), the past (ch. 29), the present (ch. 30), vow of innocence (ch. 31), Behemoth and Leviathan (40,15–42,26).

4. The first and the second speech-cycles contain eleven poems each. In cycle I (chs. 4–14) the chapter divisions exactly coincide with the disjunctions between the respective poems. In cycle II (chs. 15–26) Eliphaz's first speech is composed of two poems (15,2–16 and 15,17–35). Job's reply to Eliphaz (chs. 16–17) constitutes only one, single poem, just like Job's reply to Bildad in chs. 25–26 (see part III). The third cycle, however, contains 'only' eight poems. In chs. 27–31 the chapter divisions coincide with the caesuras between the respective poems (five poems). The first answer from the whirlwind is composed of two poems (38,2–38 and 38,39–39,30) and the second answer from the whirlwind coincides with one poem (40,7–41,26).

5. The first and the second speech-cycles contain 25 tricola each (cf. section 1.4.1–2 above). My third cycle counts 11 tricola only (see part VI, 2.1).

6. The poems in each of the speech-cycles are predominantly built up of two- and three-line strophes. In each cycle the two-line strophes are more numerous than the three-line strophes. In the third cycle, however, the figures concerned more obviously diverge than in the cycles I–II. In the first cycle occur 51 three-line strophes; this regards 153 lines on a sum total of 270 lines. That is to say 56.7% of the lines are grouped into three-line strophes. The second cycle contains 48 three-line strophes; this regards 144 lines on a sum total of 270 lines. That is to say 53.3% of the lines are grouped into three-line strophes. In the third cycle we only find 34 three-line strophes; this regards 102 lines on a sum total of again 270 lines.[45] That is to say, in cycle III 37.8% of the lines are grouped into three-line strophes.[46]

---

[45] See the following section.

[46] In this respect the third cycle is similar to the Elihu-speeches. We find 22 three-line strophes on a sum total of 159 lines. That is to say 41.5% of the lines are grouped into

7. In this context we can also place the 'contradictions' observed in sections 2.2–3 above. There I pointed to the tensions between Job's portrayal of the hopeless fate of the wicked (ch. 27) contra the description of the wicked's prosperity (ch. 21), and to the theoretical conception of wisdom (ch. 28) contra the practical conception of wisdom (chs. 4–26).

Taken together, all these differences once again point in the same direction: chs. 27–31+38–41 constitute a relatively independent dialogue between Job and God which in a later stage is inserted after the discussions between Job and his friends in chs. 3–26.

I assume that after the completion of the first and the second speech-cycles between Job and his three friends the need was felt by a later poet (wisdom teacher) to add a new speech-cycle to the already existing ones. Obviously the answer to Job's problem 'hidden' in the final poem of cycle II (chs. 25–26) somehow did not satisfy him. The answers from the whirlwind probably give an indication on which points.

- The encounter with his friends did not contribute anything to solve Job's problem. Moreover, in cycle II Job gradually reconciled himself to the idea that there would be no encounter with God on this side of the border of Sheol (see section 1.3 above). Cycles I–II did originally wind up with a short revelation (40,1–2), but this revelation cannot be taken as an answer. The answers from the whirlwind are Job's first *real encounter* with his heavenly opponent.

- The answer Job formulates in chs. 25–26 is rather terse. The answers from the whirlwind, however, are an extensive working-out of ideas we already find in chs. 25–26 and 40,1–2.

So, I believe that we are dealing here with a later poet, who felt the need to place the final conclusion of cycles I–II in another framework and to reformulate the answer more extensively. The essence of this answer remains as it is. The poem in chs. 25–26 is a hymn, a song of praise about God's greatness, omnipotence and creative power. In this hymn we find ideas which recur in chs. 38–41. In 25,4–6 (and 26,8–10) God's greatness is contrasted with man's uncleanness and littleness. The same contrast we meet in the answers from the whirlwind; see especially the final poem in 40,7–41,26 (Job cannot hold out before God). Further, in chs. 25–26 Job is confronted with the reality of his impending death. The reality of this

---

three-line strophes.

chaotic force which is operative in human life is not denied (26,5–7.11–13). At the same time Job declares in his song of praise that a human being is never completely handed over to these destructive effects (note 26,5–7). The latter paradox is comparable with the twofold intention we find in the first speech from the whirlwind. Chs. 38–39 show to Job that chaotic forces are active in the world (note 39,5–12 and 19–23). At the same time they make it clear that the world is not without order, not without a design.[47] God keeps the forces of 'uncreation' (Cotter) under control without changing his creation into a 'brave new world'. The answer to Job's problem expounded in the LORD's speeches, which round off the third cycle, does not go off at a tangent (cf. Andersen, p. 216). It is just an extensive elaboration of an idea already exposed by Job himself in chs. 25–26, the final poem of the second cycle.

2.6 The 270 poetic lines of the third speech-cycle

In the third speech-cycle we find two poems which are constructed of bicola only, chs. 27 and 38,2–38. In the other poems the bicola are interrupted at some places by one or two tricola. We can distinguish eleven tricola in the compositions of cycle III: 28,3.4 29,25 30,2–3a.15 31,7.34.35 38,41 39,25 40,15 (see part VI, 2.1).

In 30,1 and 40,23 one masoretic verse represents two lines (see part IV, 4.1 and 8.1). The verse divisions and accentuation of MT in 30,12–13 gives the impression of two tricola. The strophic structure of ch. 30 and the exceptional length of v. 12c, however, are in favour of the idea that we are dealing here with three bicola (see part IV, 4.1). In all other instances the masoretic verse divisions in cycle III coincide with the poetic lines.

On the basis of these assumptions I come to the following numbers of verse-lines for the respective poems of the third speech-cycle: 22 (ch. 27;

---

[47] See O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob* (FRLANT 121), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978. See also Parsons, *art. cit.*, p. 220 (note p. 228 n. 82); Smick (1986), pp. 98–102; Vermeylen (1986), pp. 50–52; Bezuidenhout (1987), pp. 716-17; T.N.D. Mettinger, *In Search of God*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988, pp. 185–95; Ch.R. Seitz, 'Job: Full-Structure, Movement, and Interpretation', *Interpretation* 43 (1989), pp. 14–16; and part IV, 6.6 and 7.6 above. Cf. Vermeylen (1986), p. 69: 'Job voit l'ordre du monde avec le regard de Dieu' (this author, however, changes the sequence of the speeches!); note also Maag (1982), pp. 195–96 and cf. already Terrien on Job 40,15 ff.. I do not agree with those critics who conclude that the speeches from the whirlwind do not provide an answer to Job's problem; so recently Katharine J. Dell, *The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature* (BZAW 197), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991, p. 183 ('The message seems to be that there are no answers to the questions posed') and *passim*. This implies that, in my view, the book of Job is much less sceptical than Dell will make us believe.

Job), 28 (ch. 28; Job), 24 (ch. 29; Job), 33 (ch. 30; Job), 40 (ch. 31; Job), 37 (ch. 38,2–38; God), 33 (chs. 38,39–39,30; God), 53 (chs. 40,7–41,26; God). The total number of these lines is once again **270** (cf. cycles I and II; see section 1.4 above).

The equal number of poetical lines in cycles I, II and III is a strong argument in favour of the demarcation of these units proposed in this study on the structure of the book of Job.

DEFINITIONS

acrostic: a poem in which the initial letters of each colon, or line, or strophe have a meaning when read downward (cf. PHPT, p. 3).

alliteration: any repetition of the same consonants in two or more words of a colon, line or higher structural unit, which produces a noticeable artistic effect (cf. Watson [1984], pp. 225–29 and also 'assonance').[1]

anacrusis: (Gr. 'the striking up of a tune') a word or group of words at the beginning of a line, before the rhythm proper (cf. Watson [1984], p. 110).

anaphora: (Gr. 'bring back') the repetition of similar words at the beginning of successive lines (cf. 'epiphora').

assonance: any repetition of the same vowel-sounds in two or more words of a colon, line or higher structural unit, which produces a noticeable artistic effect (cf. alliteration).[2]

bicolon: a line consisting of two cola.

canto: a subdivision of a poem, that divides and orders its content and formal framework.

canticle: a subdivision of a canto, that divides and orders its content and formal framework.

chiasm: '(Gr. "a placing crosswise," from the name of the Gr. letter X, "chi" . . .). . . . the criss-cross order and correspondence in meaning or syntax of two pairs of words, whether or not involving word repetition' (PHPT, p. 36; cf. Watson [1984], pp. 201–08).

colon: a part of a Hebrew line which, usually together with another part (sometimes two other parts), constitutes a semantic or formal parallelism.

concatenatio: a repetition of words (or grammatical forms) in two successive lines, which do not belong with the same poem, or canto, or canticle, or strophe.

---

[1] See also Stevenson (1948), pp. 98–100; Th.P. McCreesh, *Biblical Sound and Sense. Poetic Sound Patterns in Proverbs 10–29* (JSOTS 128), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991; Cotter (1992), pp. 28–31; Watson, *VT* 43 (1993), p. 381. I utilize this device, when at least three consonants are involved.

[2] See for the book of Job Stevenson (1948), pp. 98–100.

concentric structure: a pattern of formal and/or semantic correspondences by which the first element of a poetic unit recurs at the end of the unit, the second element in the second last position of the unit, and so on, while the central element has no counterpart. To put it schematically: a.b.c.b'.a' (cf. 'pivot pattern' and 'symmetric structure').

contrary indication: a formal or semantic element which does not fit the (theoretical) rhetorical framework of the poem.

distich: see 'bicolon'.

enjambement: 'The completion, in the following poetic line, of a clause or other grammatical unit begun in the preceding line; the employment of "run-on" lines which carry the sense of a statement from one line to another without rhetorical pause at the end of the line .... The term is also applied to the carrying over of meaning from one couplet or stanza to the next' (PHPT, p. 67).

envelope: 'The e. pattern is a special case of repetition .... A line or stanza will recur in the same or nearly the same form so as to enclose other material. A line or significant phrase may thus enclose a stanza or a whole poem; a complete stanza may be repeated to enclose a poem or a section of a larger poem. ... Also the repeated words carry an added richness and meaning from the intervening lines, sometimes acquiring an almost incantatory force' (PHTH, p. 67).

epiphora: (Gr. 'to add') the repetition of similar words at the end of successive lines (cf. 'anaphora').

external parallelism: a correspondence between two lines within a poem or higher rhetorical unit.

formal analysis: the structural investigation which does not take into account the meaning of the poetic elements used.

higher (poetic) unit: a poetic unit which encompasses more than one strophe, or canticle, or canto.

identical strophe/canticle/canto: a strophe/canticle/canto with the same number of lines.

inclusio: see 'envelope'.

internal parallelism: (*parallelismus membrorum*, R. Lowth) a correspondence between two or three successive cola within a line.

line: a unit of Hebrew poetry which is regularly characterized by an internal correspondence of the successive cola (mostly two, sometimes three).

linear structure: a pattern of formal and/or semantic correspondences which may schematically be described as follows: a.b.c|a'.b'.c'.

masoretic verse: a semantic unit in the Hebrew Bible of which the end is marked by a *sôp pāsûq*.

parallelism: '(Gr. "side by side"). In poetry a state of correspondence between one phrase, line, or verse with another. P. seems to be the basic aesthetic principle of poetic utterance. ... doubtless, p. was the basic element of primitive poetry before such refinements as meter and rhyme were invented' (PHPT, p. 182).

pivot pattern: see 'concentric structure'.

quasi-acrostic: a poem modelled on the length of a Hebrew alphabetic acrostic, that is to say with 22 cola, lines or strophes (cf. Watson [1984], p. 199).

refrain: 'A line, or lines, or part of a line, repeated at intervals throughout a poem, usually at regular intervals, and most often at the end of a stanza; ... A r. may be as short as a single word or as long as a stanza. ... It may be used in such a way that its meaning varies or develops from one recurrence to the next ..., or it may be used each time with a slight variation of wording appropriate to its immediate context ... The r. ... may very meaningfully emphasize some important aspect of the poem—theme, characters, or setting. ... it serves to mark off rhythmical units, and at the same time to unify the poem; and it may be very skillfully used to reinforce emotion and meaning' (PHPT, p. 227).

repetition: 'A basic unifying device in all poetry' (PHPT, p. 228).

responsio: a *linear* phenomenon of verbal repetition, by which the beginnings and/or the ends of the cantos, or the canticles, or the strophes within a poem correspond with each other.

stanza: see 'canto'.

stich: see 'colon'.

strophe: a subdivision of a canticle, canto or poem, that divides and orders its content and formal framework.

sub-stanza: see 'canticle'.

symmetric structure: a pattern of formal and/or semantic correspondences by which the first element of a poetic unit recurs at the end of the unit, the second element in the second last position of the unit, and so on. To put it schematically: a.b.c|c'.b'.a' (cf. 'concentric structure').

transition marker: a special word or grammatical form which usually indicates the first or the last line of a Hebrew strophe.

tricolon: a line consisting of three cola.

tristich: see 'tricolon'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This is a selective bibliography containing frequently cited works which will mostly be referred to by the name of the author only.

Alter, R. *The Art of Biblical Poetry*, New York: Basic Books, 1985 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990).

Andersen, F.I. *Job* (TOTC), Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976.

Bakon, S. 'The Enigma of Elihu', *Dor le Dor* 12 (1983–84), pp. 217–28.

Baldauf, C. 'Menschliches Können und göttliche Weisheit in Hiob 28', *Theologische Versuche* 13 (1983), pp. 57–68.

Ball, C.J. *The Book of Job*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1922.

Baumgärtel, F. *Der Hiobdialog, Aufriss und Deutung* (BWANT IV.9), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.

Beer, G. *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, Marburg: Elwert, 1897.

Bezuidenhout, L.C. *Struktuur en strekking van die boek Job*, DD-proefskrif, Universiteit van Pretoria, 1986.

— 'Struktuur en strekking van Job 38,39–39,30', *HTS* 43 (1987), pp. 709–22.

Bickell, G. 'Kritische Bearbeitung des Iobdialogs', *WZKM* 6 (1892), pp. 137–47.241–57.327–34 and *WZKM* 7 (1893), pp. 1–20.153–68.

— 'Nachtrag zu Job', *WZKM* 8 (1894), pp. 101–21.

— *Das Buch Job nach Anleitung der Strophik und der Septuaginta—auf seine ursprüngliche Form zurückgeführt und im Versmasse des Urtextes übersetzt*, Wien: Druck und Verlag von Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1894.

Blommerde, A.C.M. *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job* (Biblica et Orientalia 22), Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

Budde, K. 'Die Kapitel 27 und 28 des Buches Hiob', *ZAW* 2 (1882), pp. 193–274.

— *Das Buch Hiob* (HK II.1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn 1913.

Ceresko, A.R. 'The A:B::B:A Word Pattern in Hebrew and Northwest Semitic with Special Reference to the Book of Job', *UF* 7 (1975), pp. 73–88.

— 'The Chiastic Word Pattern in Hebrew', *CBQ* 38 (1976), pp. 303–11.

— 'The Function of Chiasmus in Hebrew Poetry', *CBQ* 40 (1978), pp. 1–10.

— *Job 29–31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic* (Biblica et Orientalia 36), Rom: Biblical Institute Press, 1980.

Clines, D.J.A. *Job 1–20* (Word Biblical Commentary 17), Dallas (Texas): Word Books, 1989.

Condamin, A. *Poèmes de la Bible*, Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, 2nd edn 1933.

Cotter, D.W. *A Study of Job 4–5 in the Light of Contemporary Literary Theory* (SBL Dissertation Series 124), Atlanta (Georgia): Scholars Press, 1992.

Curtis, J.B. 'Why Were the Elihu Speeches Added to the Book of Job?', *PEGLMBS* 8 (1988), pp. 93–99.

Dahood, M. 'Chiasmus in Job: A Text-Critical and Philological Criterion', in H.N. Bream a.o. (eds.), *A Light unto My Path, FS J.M. Myers* (Gettysburg Theological Studies 4), Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974, pp. 119–30.

Delitzsch, F. *Das Buch Iob* (Keil-Delitzsch IV.2), Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 2nd edn 1876.

Delitzsch, Friedrich, *Das Buch Hiob*, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902.

Dhorme, P. 'A propos d'une théorie strophique (2)', *RB* 33 (1924), pp. 411–19.

— *Le livre de Job* (Études bibliques), Paris: Gabalda, 1926.

Dillmann, A. *Hiob* (KeH 2. Lief.), Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 4th edn 1891 (3rd edn 1869).

Driver, S.R. and Gray, G.B. *The Book of Job* (ICC), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.

Duhm, B. *Das Buch Hiob* (KHC 16), Freiburg i.Br.: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897.

Ehrlich, A.B. *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* (VI, Psalmen, Sprüche und Hiob), Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1918.

Epping, C., and Nelis, J.T. *Job* (BOT 7a), Roermond: Romen & zonen, 1968.

Ewald, H. *Das Buch Iiob* (Die Dichter des Alten Bundes III), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2nd edn 1854.

Feinberg, C.L. 'The Poetic Structure of the Book of Job and the Ugaritic Literature', *Bibl Sacr* 103 (1946), pp. 283–92.

Fine, H.A. 'The tradition of a patient Job', *JBL* 74 (1955), pp. 28–32.

Fohrer, G. *Das Buch Hiob* (KAT 16), Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963.

Fox, M.V. 'Job 38 and God's Rhetoric', *Semeia* 19 (1981), pp. 53 61.

Freedman, D.N. 'The Structure of Job 3', *Biblica* 49 (1968), pp. 503 08; now in *Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy*, Winona Lake, 1980, pp. 323–28.

Geller, S.A. ' "Where is Wisdom?": A Literary Study of Job 28 in its Settings', in J. Neusner e.a. (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987, pp. 155–188.

Gordis, R. *The Book of Job* (Moreshet Series 2), New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978.

Habel, N.C. *The Book of Job* (OTL), London: SCM Press, 1985.

Hartley, J.E. *The Book of Job* (NICOT), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Herz, J. 'Formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Problem des Hiobbuches', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig* 3 (1953–54), pp. 157–62.

Hesse, F. *Hiob* (ZBK AT 14), Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1978.

Hitzig, F. *Das Buch Hiob*, Leipzig und Heidelberg: C.F. Winter, 1874.

Hölscher, G. *Das Buch Hiob* (HAT 17), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2nd edn 1952.

Hontheim, J. *Das Buch Job—als strophisches Kunstwerk nachgewiesen, übersetzt und erklärt* (Biblische Studien IX.1–3), Freiburg i.Br.: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1904.

Horst, F. *Hiob* (BK XVI.1), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.

Irwin, W.A. 'The first Speech of Bildad', *ZAW* 51 (1933), pp. 205–16.

— 'Poetic Structure in the Dialogue of Job', *JNES* 5 (1946), pp. 26–39.

Jamieson-Drake, D.W. 'Literary Structure, Genre and Interpretation in Job 38', in K.G. Hoglund a.o. (eds.), *The Listening Heart. Essays in Wisdom and the Psalms in honor of R.E. Murphy* (JSOTS 58), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987, pp. 217–35.

Keel, O. *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob* (FRLANT 121), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Kissane, E.J. *The Book of Job*, Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1939 (New York, 1946).

— 'The Metrical Structure of Job', in Paul S. Sanders (ed.) *Twentieth-Century Interpretations of the Book of Job*, Englewood Cliffs (New Jersey), 1968, pp. 78–85 (= Dublin, 1939, pp. l–lx).

König, E. *Das Buch Hiob*, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929.

Korpel, M.C.A., and Moor, J.C. de, 'Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The*

Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 1–61.

Köster, F.B. *Das Buch Hiob und der Prediger Salomos nach ihrer strophischen Anordnung übersetzt. Nebst Abhandlungen über den strophischen Charakter dieser Bücher*, Schleswig, 1831.

Krašovec, J. *Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (SupplVT 35), Leiden: Brill, 1984.

Kroeze, J.H. *Het Boek Job* (COT), Kampen: Kok, 1961.

Kubina, V. *Die Gottesreden im Buche Hiob. Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um die Einheit von Hiob 38,1–42,6* (Freiburger theologische Studien 115), Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 1979.

Kuhl, C. 'Neuere Literarkritik des Buches Hiob', *ThR* 21 (1953), pp. 163–205 and 257–317.

Kutsch, E. 'Unschuldsbekenntnis und Gottesbegegnung. Der Zusammenhang zwischen Hiob 31 und 38 ff.', in L. Schmidt and K. Eberlein (eds.), *Kleine Schriften zum Alten Testament*, (BZAW 168), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1986, pp. 308–35.

Laurin, R. 'The Theological Structure of Job', *ZAW* 84 (1972), pp. 86–89.

Lescow, Th. *Das Stufenschema. Untersuchungen zur Struktur alttestamentlicher Texte* (BZAW 211), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.

Lévêque, J. *Job et son Dieu*, 2 vols. (Études Bibliques), Paris: Gabalda, 1970.

Ley, J. 'Die metrische Beschaffenheit des Buches Hiob', *ThStKr* 68 (1895), pp. 635–92.

— *Das Buch Hiob, nach seinem Inhalt, seiner Kunstgestaltung und religiösen Bedeutung*, Halle, 1903.

Löhr, M. 'Beobachtungen zur Strophik im Buche Hiob', in *Abhandlungen zur semitischen Religionskunde und Sprachwissenschaft, FS W.W. Graf von Baudissin* (BZAW 33), Giessen, 1918, pp. 303–21.

— 'Die drei Bildad-Reden im Buche Hiob', in *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, FS K. Budde* (BZAW 34), Giessen, 1920, pp. 107–12.

— 'Job c. 28', in *Oriental Studies Presented to Paul Haupt*, Leipzig, 1926, pp. 67–70.

Loretz, O. 'Philologische und textologische Probleme in Hi. 24,1–25', *UF* 12 (1980), pp. 261–66.

Lugt, P. van der *Strofische structuren in de bijbels-hebreeuwse poëzie. De* *geschiedenis van het onderzoek en een bijdrage tot de theorievorming omtrent de strofenbouw van de Psalmen*, Kampen: Kok, 1980.

— 'Stanza-Structure and Word-Repetition in Job 3–14', *JSOT* 40 (1988), pp. 3–38.

— 'The Form and Function of the Refrains in Job 28', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, pp. 265-93.

Maag, V. *Hiob, Wandlung und Verarbeitung des Problems in Novelle, Dialogdichtung und Spätfassungen* (FRLANT 128), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

MacKenzie, R.A.F., and Murphy, R.E. 'Job', in R.E Brown a.o. (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Englewood Cliffs (New Jersey): Geoffrey Chapman, 2nd edn 1990, pp. 466–88.

Meer, W. van der, and Moor, J.C. de (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTS 74), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Mende, Theresia '"Ich weiss, dass mein Erlöser lebt" (Ijob 19,25). Ijobs Hoffnung und Vertrauen in der Prüfung des Leidens', *TTZ* 99 (1990), pp. 15–35.

Meynet, R. *L'analyse rhétorique, une nouvelle méthode pour comprendre la Bible*, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1989.

Merx, A. *Das Gedicht von Hiob*, Jena, 1871.

Michel, W.L. *Job in the Light of Northwest Semitic*, Vol. I (Biblica et Orientalia 42), Rom: Biblical Institute Press, 1987.

Miller, J.E. 'Structure and Meaning of the Animal Discourse in the Theophany of Job (38,39–39,30)', *ZAW* 103 (1991), pp. 418–21.

Möller, H. *Sinn und Aufbau des Buches Hiob*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1955.

Moor, J.C. de 'Syntax Peculiar to Ugaritic Poetry', in J.C. de Moor and W.G.E. Watson (eds.), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT 42), Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, pp. 191–205.

Müller, D.H. 'Hiob, Kap. 14', *WZKM* 11 (1897), pp. 57–62.

— *Strophenbau und Responsion. Neue Beiträge*, Wien, 1898.

— *Komposition und Strophenbau, alte und neue Beiträge* (14. Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien für das Schuljahr 1906–1907), Wien, 1907.

Müller, H.-P. *Das Hiobproblem* (EdF 84), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978.

— 'Die sog. Straußenperikope in den Gottesreden des Hiobbuches', *ZAW* 100 (1988), pp. 90–105.

Muraoka, T. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*, Jerusalem and Leiden: The Magnes Press, 1985.

Murphy, R.E. *Wisdom Literature: Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes and Esther* (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 13), Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1981.

Niccacci, A. 'Giobbe 28', *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Liber Annuus* 31 (1981), pp. 29–58.

Oorschot, J. van *Gott als Grenze. Eine literar- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Gottesreden des Hiobbuches* (BZAW 170), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.

Parsons, G.W. 'The Structure and Purpose of the Book of Job', *BS* 138/551 (1981), pp. 139–57.

— 'Literary Features of the Book of Job', *BS* 138/551 (1981), pp. 213–29.

Peters, N. *Das Buch Job* (EH 21), Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff, 1928.

Pope, M.H. *Job* (AB 15), Garden City (New York): Doubleday, 3rd edn 1973.

Régnier, M.A. 'La distribution des chapitres 25–28 du livre de Job', *RB* 33 (1924), pp. 186–200.

Reiske, J.J. *Coniecturae in Jobum et Proverbia Salomonis*, Leipzig, 1779.

Reventlow, H.G. 'Tradition und Redaktion im Hiob 27 im Rahmen der Hiobreden des Abschnittes Hi 24-27', *ZAW* 94 (1982), pp. 279-93.

Rozelaar, M. *Het Boek Job*, Kampen: Kok, 1984.

Sawyer, J.F.A. 'The Authorship and Structure of the Book of Job', in *Studia Biblica 1978: I O.T.* (JSOTS 11), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979, pp. 253–57.

Schlögl, N. ' "Entgegnung" ', *OLZ* 4 (1901), columns 415–18.

— *Die echte biblisch-hebräische Metrik* (Biblische Studien XVII.1), Freiburg i.Br., 1912.

— *Das Buch Ijjob* (Die heiligen Schriften des Alten Bundes III.2), Wien und Leipzig: Orionverlag, 1916.

Schlottmann, K. *Das Buch Hiob*, Berlin: Wiegandt & Brieben, 1851.

Schnurrer, C.F. *Animadversiones ad quaedam loca Iobi*, Tübingen, 1781.

Schultens, A. *Liber Iobi*, Leiden, 1737 (2nd ed 1773).

Selms, A. van *Job*, 2 vols. (POT), Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1982–83.

Settlemire, C.C. 'The Original Position of Job 28', in H.D. Thompson (ed.), *The Answers Lie Below: Essays in honor of L.E. Toombs*, Lanham (Maryland): University Press of America, 1984, pp. 287–317.

Skehan, P.W. 'Strophic Patterns in the Book of Job', *CBQ* 23 (1961), pp. 125–42; now in P.W. Skehan, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQ Monograph Series 1), Washington, 1971, pp. 96–113.

— 'Job's Final Plea (Job 29–31) and the Lord's Reply (Job 38–41)', *Biblica* 45 (1964), pp. 51–61; now in P.W. Skehan, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQ Monograph Series 1), Washington, 1971, pp. 114–23.

— ' "I will speak up!" (Job 32). The Pit (Job 33)', *CBQ* 31 (1969), pp. 380–82; now in P.W. Skehan, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQ Monograph Series 1), Washington, 1971, pp. 85–88.

Smick, E.B. 'Architectonics, Structured Poems, and Rhetorical Devices in the Book of Job', in W.C. Kaiser and R.F. Youngblood (eds.), *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1986, pp. 87–104.

Snaith, N.H. *The Book of Job: Its Origin and Purpose*, London: SCM Press, 2nd edn 1972.

Steuernagel, C. *Das Buch Hiob* (HSAT II), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 4th edn 1923.

Stevenson, W.B. *The Poem of Job: A Literary Study with a New Translation*, London: OUP, 2nd edn 1948.

Stickel, J.G. *Das Buch Hiob, rhythmisch gegliedert und übersetzt*, Leipzig, 1842.

Swanepoel, M.G. 'Job 12—An(other) Anticipation of the Voice from the Whirlwind?', *OTE* 4 (1991), pp. 192–205.

Szczygiel, P. *Das Buch Job* (HS V.1), Bonn: Hanstein, 1931.

Terrien, S.L. *Job* (CAT 13), Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963.

Tur-Sinai, N.H. *The Book of Job*, Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 2nd edn 1967.

Vermeylen, J. *Job, ses amis et son dieu* (Studia Biblica 2), Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Vetter, P. *Die Metrik des Buches Job* (Biblische Studien II.4), Freiburg i.Br.: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1897.

Vogels, W. *Job* (Belichting van het Bijbelboek), KBS, 1989.

Volz, P. *Weisheit—Das Buch Hiob, Sprüche und Jesus Sirach, Prediger* (SAT III.2), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.

Wahl, H.-M. *Der gerechte Schöpfer. Eine redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung der Elihureden—Hiob 32–37* (BZAW 207), Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.

Watson, W.G.E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTS 26), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.

— 'Problems and solutions in Hebrew verse: a survey of recent work', *VT* 43 (1993), p. 372–84.

Webster, E.C. 'Strophic Patterns in Job 3–28', *JSOT* 26 (1983), pp. 33–60.

— 'Strophic Patterns in Job 29–42', *JSOT* 30 (1984), pp. 95–109.

Weiser, A. *Das Buch Hiob* (ATD 13), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 5th edn 1968.

Westermann, C. *Der Aufbau des Buches Hiob* (Calwer Theologische Monographien A.6), Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 3rd edn 1978.

Wilde, A. de *Das Buch Ḥiob* (OTS 22), Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Wolfers, D. 'Elihu: The Provenance and Content of His Speech', *Dor le Dor* 16 (1987–88), pp. 90–98.

—, 'The speech-cycles in the book of Job', *VT* 43 (1993), pp. 385–402.

Wright, G.H.B. *The book of Job. A new critically revised translation with essays on scansion, date etc.*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1883.

Zamodi, J. 'The Wisdom Hymn (28) and Its Place in the Book of Job', *Beth Mikra* 94 (1983), pp. 268–277.

OUDTESTAMENTISCHE STUDIËN

Edited by A.S. van der Woude

15. *The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies.* 1969. ISBN 90 04 03099 9
17. *The Witness of Tradition.* Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Woudschoten (Holland), September 1970. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03343 2
18. LABUSCHAGNE, C.J.; LEEUWEN, C. VAN; MULDER, M.J.; BRONGERS, H.A.; JONGELING, B.; DEQUEKER, L.; BOER, P.A.H. DE. *Syntax and meaning.* Studies in Hebrew Syntax and Biblical Exegesis. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03785 3
19. *Language and Meaning.* Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at London, 1973. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03943 0
20. *Instruction and Interpretation.* Studies in Hebrew Language, Palestinian Archaeology and Biblical Exegesis. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Louvain, 1976. 1977. ISBN 90 04 05433 2
21. ALBREKTSON, B.; et al. *Remembering All the Way...* A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06305 6
22. WILDE, A. DE (ed.). *Das Buch Hiob.* Eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06372 2
23. *Prophets, worship and theodicy.* Studies in Prophetism, Biblical Theology and Structural and Rhetorical Analysis, and the Place of Music in Worship. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Woudschoten, 1982. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07035 4
24. *Crises and Perspectives.* Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Polytheism, Biblical Theology, Palestinian Archaeology and Intertestamental Literature. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Cambridge, U.K., 1985. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07873 8
25. WOUDE, A.S. VAN DER (ed.). *New avenues in the study of the Old Testament.* A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap and the Retirement of Prof. Dr. M.J. Mulder. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09125 4
26. WOUDE, A.S. VAN DER (ed.). *In Quest of the Past.* Studies in Israelite Religion, Literature and Prophetism. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference, Held at Elspeet, 1988. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09192 0
27. BOER, P.A.H. DE; DUIN, C. VAN. *Selected Studies in Old Testament Exegesis.* 1991. ISBN 90 04 09342 7
28. SMELIK, K.A.D. *Converting the Past.* Studies in Ancient Israelite and Moabite Historiography. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09480 6
29. DIRKSEN, P.B.; VAN DER KOOIJ, A. (eds.). *Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891). His Major Contributions to the Study of the Old Testament.* A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Centenary of Abraham Kuenen's Death (10 December 1991). 1993. ISBN 90 04 09732 5
30. HOUTMAN, C. *Der Himmel im Alten Testament.* Israels Weltbild und Weltanschauung. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09690 6
31. PEELS, H.G.L. *The Vengeance of God.* The Meaning of the Root NQM and the Function of the NQM-Texts in the Context of Divine Revelation in the Old Testament. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10164 0
32. LUGT, P. VAN DER. *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10326 0

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

DATE DUE

MAR 2 9 2000
APR 2 4 2000
MAR 0 7 2002

Printed
in USA

BS 1415.2 .V36 1995

Van der Lugt, Pieter.

Rhetorical criticism and the
poetry of the book of Job

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00036943